1-1-1972

The use of children's literature in the teaching of critical reading.

William F. Coughlin
University of Massachusetts Amherst

THE USE OF CHILDREN'S LITERATURE IN THE TEACHING OF CRITICAL READING

A Dissertation Presented

By

William F. Coughlin, Jr.

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

October 1 1972

Major Subject Education

THE USE OF CHILDREN'S LITERATURE IN THE TEACHING OF CRITICAL READING

by

William F. Coughlin, Jr.

A Dissertation submitted to the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, in pertial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts
October 1, 1972

Approved as to style and content by:

Chairman

Head of Department

Member

Member

Member

to Tae-Ellen and the spirit of Toivo Syystalve

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General Statement

The purpose of this study was to investigate the possibility of utilizing children's literature in the instruction of critical reading as a viable alternative in the teaching of literature. The study attempted to demonstrate that children's literature as a classroom subject could be employed effectively in the instruction of critical reading. So that any positive results achieved would have more relevance to the teaching of literature, the study also includes a rationale for teaching critical reading. This rationale is offered in Chapter II in a review of literature relating to that subject by recognized literary critics as well as authorities in the field of English education. Justification for the use of children's literature in the instruction of critical reading is offered in the form of a field-test in which children's literature was used as the sole subject considered in a unit devoted to the instruction of the process of critical reading. The outcome of the study was that children's literature was found to hold promise as an effective tool, in the context of the field-test, in the teaching of critical reading, thereby offering a new method which should be subjected to more comprehensive experimentation and then, depending on the results, possibly utilized in the instruction of literature.

Sub-Problems

If the study were to be successful, a series of specific tasks had to be performed. The first of these was the offering of a rationale for the

teaching of critical reading as a key point necessary in the teaching of literature. A basic philosohpical premise regarding the study of literature, one which in effect prompted the study, is perhaps best stated in the words of Northrop Frye:

> . . . at no point is there any direct learning of literature itself. Physics is an organized body of knowledge about nature, and a student of it says he is learning Physics, not nature. Art, like nature, has to be distinguished from the systematic study of it, which is criticism. It is therefore impossible to 'learn literature'; one learns about it in a certain way, but what one learns, transitively, is the criticism of literature. Similarly the difficulty often felt in 'teaching literature' arises from the fact that it cannot be done; the criticism of literature is all that can be directly taught (Frye, 1971, p. 11).

This rationale is developed and defended in Chapter II. Next, the efficacy of employing children's stories as a means of teaching critical reading had to be demonstrated. The stories selected for use in the classroom field-test were those of recognized craftsmen. Copies of the texts themselves are in Appendix III. They include: The Bat-Poet, by Randall Jarrell; Zlateh The Goat, by Isaac Bashevis Singer; Story Number 1, by Eugene Ionesco; and Frederick, by Leo Lionni.

Finally, the field-test itself had to be conducted. The children's stories selected were used in a classroom made up of randomly selected students at Lowell Technological Institute. The classroom approach focused on examining the stories analytically. Classroom activity centered on the relationship of form to content in the works. The emphasis was on how the author manipulated the elements of his story in creating his art.

In order to evaluate the results of the trial a pre-test was administered before the unit was presented. This pre-test attempted to ascertain the attitude of the students toward literature and their knowledge of the elements that comprise the tools an author utilizes in creating a work of fiction--form, content, plot, etc. It also attempted to ascertain the students' ability to defend rationally their opinions regarding a work of fiction, i.e., to determine if the students possessed a method of reading whereby they consistently defended their opinions regarding a work of literature based on some element other than their own personal reactions.

Following the pre-test the unit was taught. At the end of the unit a post-test was administered. The purpose of the post-test was to determine if there had been any significant change in the students' attitude toward literature. The post-test also attempted to ascertain if the students increased their knowledge of the elements of fiction. Most importantly, the post-test attempted to determine if the students possessed a method of evaluating a work of fiction based on tangible evidence contained in the work itself rather than their own opinions.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study the following definitions will apply throughout:

Critical reading: Reading of a work of fiction with constant attention being paid to the structure of the work and the relation of that structure to the content. Critical reading results in an

opinion of a work, ". . . that is capable of giving some intelligible account of itself. Such criticism engages in analysis--the examination of the parts and their relation to the whole (Barnet, Berman, & Burto, 1960, p. 26)." In essence critical reading is the ability to read and see the relationship of the form of a work to its theme, the ability to see how the author made his meaning.

Form: The arrangement of the elements within a work. "In a common division, critics distinguish between form and content, form being the pattern or structure or organization which is employed to give expression to the content (Thrall, Hibbard, & Holman, 1961, p. 206)."

Structure: See Form. For purposes of this study form and structure are synonymous terms.

Theme: The underlying idea which the author wishes to convey. Theme is "the central or dominating idea in a literary work . . . it is the abstract concept which is made concrete . . . (Thrall, Hibbard, & Holman, 1961, p. 486)." Theme is what the author said in his work as opposed to form and structure which deal with how he said it.

Content: See Theme. For purposes of this study theme and content are synonymous terms.

Elements of Form: The elements of form are those components which it is generally agreed make up the structural aspects of a work of fiction. For purposes of this study these elements will include plot, character, setting, conflict, point of view, and tone; some of these

elements will contain inherent sub-divisions which will be defined in the definition of the element to which they relate, e.g., a definition of plot will contain an explanation of beginning, middle, and end.

Plot: "A plot is what happens, a plot is the action (Brooks, Purser, & Warren, 1952, p. 11)," of a story. "Distinctions between 'plot' and 'story' vary widely, but for many critics story is the sequence in which events occur as parts of a happening, and plot is the sequence the author arranges (narrates or dramatizes) them (Barnet, Berman, & Burto, 1960, p. 67)." According to Aristotle plot "is simply this, the combination of the incidents, or things done in the story (Roberts & Bywater, 1954, p. 231)." "For an action to have unity, according to Aristotle, (Ch. 8), 'the events of which it is made up must be so plotted that if any of these elements is moved or removed the whole is altered and upset. For when a thing can be included or not included without making any noticeable difference, that thing is no part of the whole (Barnet, Berman, & Burto, 1960, p. 68).'" Thrall, Hibbard, and Holman are perhaps correct when they write "it is perhaps more helpful to describe plot than to define it with generalities. The incidents which are a part of a plot are, it has been said, (1) planned; they are preconceived by the author; they spring from his conscious thought; they are not simply taken over from life. No matter how realistic an author may be, he must arrange and select his incidents according to a plot purpose since life itself only rarely,

if ever, unfolds according to the plans of a fiction plot. Plot is, too, (2) a series of actions moving from a beginning through a logically related sequence to a logical and natural outcome (Thrall, Hibbard, & Holman, 1961, pp. 356-357)." As was stated before, plot, in the simplest sense, is what happens, "but in the sense of fiction 'what happens' achieves its unity by reason of its logic, the principle that connects one thing to another (Brooks, Purser, & Warren, 1952, pp. 20-22)." Usually a plot will have a beginning, a middle, and an end; "a beginning is that which is not itself necessarily after anything else, and which has naturally something else after it; an end is that which is naturally after something itself, either as its necessary or usual consequent, and with nothing else after it; and a middle, that which is by nature after one thing and has also another after it (Roberts & Bywater, 1954, p. 233)." While a definition of plot may be simplified to a statement as unadorned as, "the action of a story," the ability to evaluate a plot from a critical standpoint requires more than the capacity to observe that a tale is made up of a series of events. The critical reader must be aware that the events must be logically and carefully structured. These events must have some cause and effect relationship, either episodic or thematic. As was mentioned before the presentation of a sequence of events is merely the offering of a story; and, while a story is usually the beginning or the skeleton of a plot, it is quite possible to have a story and not have a true literary plot. As E. M. Forster writes, "What the story does do . . .

all it can do, is to transform us from readers to listeners, to whom 'a' voice speaks, the voice of the tribal narrator, squatting in the middle of the cave, and saying one thing after another until the audience falls asleep among their offal and bones. The story is primitive; it reaches back to the origins of literature (Forster, 1954, p. 87)." In contrast to the individual who is limited to listening to a story is the more sophistocated reader who is aware that "the plot maker expects us to remember, we expect him to leave no loose ends. Every action or word ought to count; it ought to be economical and spare; even when complicated it should be organic and free from dead matter. And over it, as it unfolds, will hover the memory of the reader . . . and (he) will constantly rearrange and reconsider, seeing new clues, new chains of cause and effect, and the final sense (if the plot has been a fine one) will not be of clues or chains, but of something aesthetically compact, something which might have been shown by the novelist straight away, only if he had shown it straight away it would never have become beautiful (Forster, 1954, p. 88)."

Character: The characters are the doers of the action. If a plot is the action of a story, what happens in a story, the characters are what cause the action or happening. "A good plot does not exist by itself, but as a result of the relationship of characters to each other (Brooks, Purser, & Warren, 1952, p. 10)." While a plot cannot exist without characters and vice versa, nonetheless character can be considered as a separate element of fiction and can be examined

as such. In fiction an author "reveals the characters of imaginary persons. The creation of images of these imaginary persons (must be) so credible that they exist for the reader as real within the limits of fiction (Thrall, Hibbard, & Holman, 1961, p. 79)." There are four generally agreed methods which an author will employ in the presentation or development of a character: (1) Direct method. The author tells the reader what the character is like. "Harry was a kind boy. Harry was a lazy boy. Harry was . . ."; (2) Action method. Here the plot, in effect, serves as the vehicle by which the reader comes to understand the character. The character reveals himself through what he does; (3) Indirect method. Here the author reveals a character by showing other characters' reactions to him. For example, when characters in a work are talking about Harry, they are telling the reader about him. In addition, they are also disclosing aspects of their own character; (4) Dialogue method. Here the author reveals a character through what a character says and the manner in which he says it. Though there may be multiple variations of these methods as well as additions to them, (e.g., the touchstone method, whereby a character is developed through his association with a person or object) for the purposes of this study, the aforementioned methods of characterization will be those chiefly focused upon.

Setting: Setting is where and when the action takes place. "The elements which go to make up a setting are: (1) the actual geographical location, its topography, scenery, and such physical arrangements

as the location of the windows and doors in a room; (2) the occupations and daily manner of living of the characters; (3) the time or period in which the action takes place, e.g., epoch in history, season of the year, etc.; (4) the general environment of the characters, e.g., religious, mental, moral, social, and emotional conditions through which the people in the narrative move (Thrall, Hibbard, & Holman, 1961, p. 453)." As is the case with the other elements of form the critical significance of setting will be determined by the role it plays in relation to the other components in any given work. In one work the setting may provide little other than a time and a place where the plot unfolds; in another it may be more important. "The setting . . . often contributes to the atmosphere (Barnet, Berman, & Burto, 1960, p. 9)." Atmosphere is "the prevailing tone or mood of a literary work, particularly--but not exclusively--when that mood is established in part by the setting or landscape . . . Examples are the somber mood established by the description of the prison door in the opening chapter of Hawthorne's The Scarlet Letter, the brooding sense of fatality engendered by the description of Egdon Heath at the beginning of Hardy's The Return of The Native . . . (Thrall, Hibbard, & Holman, 1961, p. 38). . .," the ominous foreboding of the first change in weather in Singer's Zlateh The Goat. The importance of a particular setting in a work of fiction is not determined by what the setting is but rather by why the author chose a particular time and place for a particular action to unfold, how a particular time and place relate to the other elements of a work of fiction.

Conflict: A conflict is "the struggle which grows out of the interplay of the two opposing forces in a plot. It is conflict which provides the elements of interest and suspense in any form of fiction, whether it be a drama, a novel, or a short story. At least one of the opposing forces is usually a person, or, if an animal, or an inanimate object, is treated as though it were a person (Thrall, Hibbard, & Holman, 1961, p. 105)." The hero of a work is called the protagonist. "If he is opposed chiefly by a second person rather than by a force such as Fate or God or by an aspect of himself, the opposing figure is the antagonist (Barnet, Berman, & Burto, 1960, p. 69)." It is generally agreed that there are five main types of conflict. They are: (1) man vs. man, (2) man vs. himself, (3) man vs. nature, (4) man vs. society, and (5) man vs. the preternatural. Though other types of conflict may exist, e.g., man vs. machine, the five types listed will be focused upon in this study. In effect, it is the conflict in a story which actually makes the story. "It is customary to speak of all plots as involving conflict (Scholes, ed. 1966, p. 11)." It is the conflict that keeps the reader turning pages in order that he may discover not so much what happens next as he wishes to find out who won.

Point of View: Point of view is "a term used in the analysis and criticism of fiction to describe the way in which the reader is presented with the materials of the story, or, viewed from another angle, the vantage point from which the author presents the action of the story (Thrall, Hibbard, & Holman, 1961, p. 371)." It is

generally agreed that there are certain standard types of points of view which are most often employed, e.g., first-person observer, first-person participant, third-person objective, third-person omniscient, etc. While a knowledge of the advantages and disadvantages of each of these points of view is helpful, more important is recognizing why a particular point of view was used, how it relates to the other elements of fiction in a work in developing the theme. "To say that a story is told in the first or the third person will tell us nothing of importance unless we become more precise and describe how the particular qualities of the narrators relate to specific effects (Booth, 1961, p. 150)."

Tone: Tone is "the attitude of the author, as the reader infers it, in the work. Just as a speaker's tone of voice may indicate an attitude toward his subject and his hearer of, say, scorn or delight or solemnity, so an author's tone is his attitude (Barnet, Berman, & Burto, 1960, p. 86)." In effect tone is the most all-pervasive element of fiction in that the author's attitude toward his theme will be reflected in the structuring of his plot, the development of his characters, the selection and description of his setting, etc. Why a certain episode is placed where it is in the plot, why a certain word is used to describe a character's facial expression can provide insights into the work which can help bring the work into focus. "In short, the author's judgment is always present, always evident . . . we must never forget that though the author can to some

extent choose his disguises, he can never choose to disappear (Booth, 1961, p. 20)."

Limitations Of The Study

Any study which has as its ultimate end the improvement of instruction in the area of literature must of necessity accept certain limitations. Considering the nature of the subject matter at hand, to attempt too much would result in the accomplishment of nothing. Accordingly, this study was not an attempt to endow the student with "an appreciation of literature," or present him with a skeleton key which would definitively unlock answers to the questions raised by "Hamlet" or Moby Dick. What was intended here was simply the presentation of a process, i.e., the process of critical reading. The study did not even assume that, at its completion, the students would be by any real measure of the term "literary critics." As has been stated, its purpose was simply the presentation of a process. The study endeavored to give the students an operational method of critical reading. Its objective was to make the students aware that a work of fiction is a deliberately created thing and that the construction can be analyzed and examined with some degree of objectivity. The purpose of the study was to provide the student with a method of reading which he could employ when he approached any work of fiction. Though the final destination of the study may have been, in truth, the appreciation of literature, its focus was on the narrow path of critical reading which can lead to that end.

Basic Assumptions

This study does not assume that critical reading is the best approach that can be taken in the instruction of literature, only that it may be able to help. It is recognized that all approaches to literature are in effect critical in that they all have at their center the ultimate judgment of the work, whether approached historically, sociologically, biographically, psychologically, or humanistically. It is recognized that all these "critical approaches are, in a sense, simply methodologies, techniques designed to give the reader an orderly and relatively thorough entry into one aspect of a work of literature (Lemon, 1969, p. 16)." Chapter II goes more deeply into the reason why analytical reading, i.e., critical reading, is an effective methodology.

The study also assumes that one of the primary goals of any literature program should be the presentation of a method of reading. If the objectives of a literature program are limited to the instilling of cultural heritage, or promoting an "appreciation" of the "great thoughts" or the offering of vicarious experiences it is deficient. Instead, the focus should be on the presentation of a process, a method, by which the student can, on his own, without the assistance of the instructor, approach a work of fiction and be able to evaluate it on some objective basis. For example, the teaching of The Old Man and the Sea has a higher end other than the presentation of the ideas contained in the work. The study of that work should enable the students to approach The Sun Also Rises, or any other work for that matter, with greater confidence and skill.

This idea of the teaching of a method is in no way alien to the

English classroom. If asked why composition is taught, any English teacher, except perhaps the most incompetent, could be expected to supply a plethora of reasons. It can be safely assumed that one of the chief reasons would be the simple fact that familiarity with the fundamentals of coherent writing can make life easier for the students. English teachers are very much aware of their responsibility in this regard. They know they must give their students a method of writing. That which is written is secondary to the manner in which it is presented. "Unity, coherence and emphasis" are the passwords of the day. It is the method that matters and this is as it should be. It is the teachers' task to equip their students with the skills that will best enable them to function in the world long after the instructor's correcting pen has run dry. This study assumes that in the realm of reading this devotion to method should also be emphasized.

CHAPTER II

RATIONALE FOR TEACHING CRITICAL READING

One factor that obviously affect the degree of facility with which a subject is taught is the nature of the subject itself. Few would argue against the probable ease of teaching something that is inherently simple as opposed to the difficulty of teaching something that is inherently complex. Literature is, by its nature, complex. A natural inference that can be drawn is that literature is difficult to teach. Indeed, very few of those who teach literature are likely to argue this point. One semester teaching literature in a high school or college classroom painfully reinforces the awareness of the difficulty involved when attempting to teach such a complex subject. Perhaps, then, literature, that inherently complex "thing," should not be taught. Perhaps in its stead, criticism, an inherently less labyrinthian subject, should be. "As Kenneth Burke put it, literature works by complexity and criticism by simplicity, and a simplicity is precisely what a complexity is not (Lemon, 1969, p. 13)." It would only seem reasonable then that the teacher of literature should focus on that aspect of his subject matter which helps simplify it.

Regarding the role of the teaching of criticism as vital in the instruction of literature, Northrop Frye goes so far as to say:

> . . . at no point is there any direct learning of literature itself. Physics is an organized body of knowledge about nature, and a student of it says he is learning Physics, not nature. Art, like nature, has to be distinguished from the systematic study of it, which is criticism. It is therefore impossible to 'learn literature;' one learns about it in a certain way, but what one learns, transitively, is the criticism of literature. Similarly,

> the difficulty often felt in 'teaching literature' arises from the fact that it cannot be done; the criticism of literature is all that can be directly taught (Frye, 1971, p. 11).

At first glance this statement may seem a bit extreme. Certainly millions of students have been exposed to literature courses, and not all of them would claim that they had been studying criticism, even those who enjoyed the courses and derived a great deal of pleasure and benefit from them. However, a brief investigation into the nature of literature may lend a great deal of credence to Mr. Frye's thesis and at the same time belie those students of literature who would deny being students of criticism.

Just what is "literature"? It is defined as, ". . . writings in prose or verse; esp. writings having excellence of form or expression. . . (Merriam & Webster, 1963, p. 494)."

> Literature . . . is one of the arts, distinguished from the other arts in that it is a verbal structure. Commonly defined as that part of the total of preserved writings belonging to a culture which is notable for literary form, as distinguished from works of merely technical or erudite, journalistic or ephemeral nature, literature is shaped content, significant form. It is a structure of words composed in such a way that there is a harmony of all related parts to the whole. (Rohrberger & Woods & Dukore, 1969, p. 4).

Literature, then, can be said to be a verbal presentation characterized by its intricate structure, its subtlety of form. However, any complete definition of literature must take into account its other dimensions.

> Besides being a verbal structure, literature is a meaningful structure; it involves one in experiences that he values; it provides knowledge that he values;

> it enables him to participate vicariously in an immense variety of experiences; and, in so doing, it provides a means toward greater knowledge and eventual wisdom (Rohrberger & Woods & Dukore, 1968, p. 5).

In addition, ". . . literature is said to have an aesthetic value; the response to literature as an art form is called the aesthetic response, and the response is to its beauty . . . The response is somewhat hard to define, but everyone knows what it is . . . It is a pleasurable response (Rohrberger & Woods & Dukore, 1968, p. 3)."

It is obvious that literature cannot be allotted a simple one dimensional definition. The structure which is so vital a characteristic of any writing worthy of being termed "literature" is no more important, in many respects, than the purpose of the work, the meaning of the work, and the reader's reaction to the work. Norman Foerster takes into account all these elements and even adds to them when he defines literature as being ". . . the record, in terms of beauty, of the striving of Mankind to know and express itself (Foerster, in Stauffer, 1963, p. 83)." Literature, by its nature, is a very complex thing.

At this point it would appear that literature is complicated primarily because it is a dual-natured art. On the one hand it is an art characterized by its intricate form, and on the other hand its meaning, its values, its truth. For purposes of discussion here these two parts will be labeled form and theme. Regarding this interrelationship of parts, James Moffett writes, ". . . <u>what</u> is merely a factor of <u>how</u>; . . . we can no more separate the story from the telling then, as Yeats said, 'we can tell the dancer from the dance (Moffett, 1968, p. 122).'" Put another way, ". . . the

more closely acquainted we become with literature. . . the more we realize that the way the thing is done, and what the thing means, are scarcely to be separated (Brooks, Purser & Warren, 1952, p. 16)."

However, if literature is to be discussed, or if the student is to grow in his ability to read, evaluate and select ever finer and finer works, these two elements must be separated at least for purposes of discussion. To attempt to definitively state what Melville "means" in "The Symphony" chapter of Moby Dick without relating that segment to the rest of the novel's structure is impossible if the interpretation is to have any validity whatever. Form and theme in literature are like Siamese twins joined at the head and heart. To separate them is to destroy the whole; however, the phenomenon of their existence can never be fully understood unless they are separated and examined. Norman Foerster states:

> . . . if there is any sense at all in the history of criticism from Greek antiquity to the present century two kinds of value are inherent in literature, esthetic and ethical. Let it be granted at once that esthetic value and ethical value are interdependent and, in all strictness, blended inseparably; still it has not been found possible to discuss them both adequately at one and the same time (Foerster, in Stauffer, 1963, p. 69).

Like Stephen Dedalus and his homeland, there must be a bifurcation before there can be a unification.

When Frye says that literature cannot be taught, like Foerster, he is emphasizing the fact that both aspects of literature cannot be dealt with simultaneously. When he says that the criticism of literature is all that can be taught, he is focusing on the fact that the only aspect of literature which can be operationally dealt with in a teaching situation is the

structured aspect of the work, i.e., its form.

Emphasis on the teaching of critical reading should not be construed as total involvement with structure as opposed to any consideration of content. Rather, critical reading is a way of clarifying content. Critical reading takes into account the dual nature of literature. Critical reading is reading a work of fiction with constant attention being paid to the structure of the work and the relation of that structure to the content (italics mine). Critical reading results in an opinion of a work, ". . .'that is capable of giving some intelligible account of itself.' Such criticism engages in analysis--the examination of the parts and their relation to the whole (Barnet, Berman & Burto, 1969, p. 26)." In essence, critical reading is the ability to read and see the relationship of the form of a work to its theme, the ability to see how the author made his meaning.

Frye is by no means isolated in his insistence that criticism be emphasized in the literature classroom. Regarding the nature of literature and the necessity of focusing on criticism when teaching literature, Geraldine Murphy writes:

> When linguistic acts--whatever their subject or their intention, whether fiction or non-fiction, whatever their particular form--are ordered sufficiently to give to a certain extent the experience of a harmonious whole, they are to that extent, literary. The greater the degree of organization, the greater the literary effect and the greater the artistic and aesthetic value. A piece of writing is a work of literature, or a good work, or a great work, depending upon the relative complexity of its organization.
>
> It is the significance of its experience, not the universality of its arguments that makes a great work 'great'... The greatest theme, ineptly rendered, has

> little or no literary value. But works, already considered great because of the richness of their organizations, are often further ranked by the significance of their experiences (Murphy, 1968, p. 21).

> Our teaching must make clear that a work is a completed artistic product. It decides which interpretations are valid. And valid interpretations will always be those that take into account the total organization of the work, the interdependence of all its parts. Our study of a work, then, may begin with the data, but it must concentrate on what organizes the data into this biography; it may begin with what the story is about, but it must stress what makes the subject matter this story. It is only by noticing organization that students can have the unique experience of each work (Murphy, 1969, p. 45).

Robert Scholes says:

> Better than anyone else, a teacher knows that literature cannot be taught. We can use literature to teach history or philosophy or sociology or some combination of these ideas which we call 'the history of ideas;' we can even teach literary history. Or we can teach literary criticism (Scholes, 1966, p. IX).

Louise Rosenblatt, an English Education expert whose approach to the teaching of literature focuses on the student's affective reaction to theme, also recognized the necessity of a cognitive grasp of form. She writes:

> Pleasure arises from discovering the kind of structure that the artist is creating, from seeing things fall into a pattern. Awareness of the function of various characters or episodes or images illuminates what the work as a whole 'means' (Rosenblatt, 1968, p. 48).

James Moffett also agrees that theme can best be seen when the form is critically analyzed. He states:

> You cannot separate the tale from the telling. Beneath the content of every message is intent. And form embodies that intent. Intuitively or not, an author

> chooses his techniques according to his meaning. Spontaneous attention to form will tell the reader more about what the author is doing and what he means than a direct analysis of meaning will do--besides preserving his pleasure (Moffett, 1969, p. 145).

Rosenblatt and Moffett both mention that pleasure can come from reading and focusing on the structure of a work. They are in no way isolated in their recognition that critical reading perhaps offers more fun for the student than any other approach.

> Critical reading, in the long run, yields pleasure. It should, since the purpose of most literature is to give pleasure. But how is this achieved? 'Nothing can permanently please,' said Coleridge, 'which does not contain in itself the reason why it is so and not otherwise.' If analysis destroys the pleasure of reading a work of literary art, then there is something wrong with the method of analysis, because surely there is a double pleasure in discovering what it is in something that gives it the power to please permanently (Lamson, Smith, Maclean & Douglas, p. XIV).

Margaret Early carries this attitude that critical reading is more pleasurable reading over into motivation in the classroom. She feels that as students develop their abilities to read critically, and as their reading pleasure correspondingly increases, they will be motivated to continue reading on their own. Furthermore, as they develop their skills, they will be better equipped to continue reading. She says, ". . . readers who have reached the stage of conscious delight no longer need to be taught. This is not to say that deepening of appreciation ceases; rather, now the reader is equipped on his own (Early, in Burton & Simmons, 1965, p. 84)."

J. N. Hook perhaps best sums up the pleasure that can come from critical reading when he says, "It is fun to read literature even though

one does not recognize the writer's techniques, but it is more fun when we do know what the writer has done to move us (Hook, 1959, p. 124)."

At the very least a contemporary reader should have the critical skill to be able to examine news reports, political speeches, and advertising on a more than cursory level. At best he should be able to approach a work of fiction in such a manner that it opens completely to his examination. He should be able to differentiate between the shoddy and the sublime, the trite and the profound. This ability would in no way detract from a reader's interest in the sports page, but rather add a new dimension to his life. Critical reading is infinitely more rewarding than indolent reading. Richard Atlick says:

> Seldom have they (meaning the great writers of the past) 'written down'; they have written for their intellectual equals. This is true also of the contemporary writers whose work is most often worth reading. They refuse to make concessions to the unambitious reader. And yet what these people say can make a tremendous difference in your life--if only you will read them (Atlick, 1959, p. XIX).

The value of critical reading goes beyond ever the ability to see through propaganda or the personal satisfaction that can come from understanding great works. Helen Robinson believes that ". . . critical reading is basic to appreciation of literature, to arriving at sound conclusions concerning personal and social problems, to scientific investigation--in short--to the educated man (Stauffer, 1964)."

Yet there is strong feeling on the part of some that this ability to read in depth is far from one of the strong points of our educational system.

> Newspaper reporters, magazine writers, the authors of 'popular' novels and non-fiction works, all assume necessarily that the great reading public is made up of people who want to be amused or instructed without pain, cost, or obligation. They want what they read to be custom made for them. It must contain few words they they do not understand, few allusions they have not learned in high school, few ideas that force them to do some serious thinking. The "average" reader, including the college freshman, who is an "average" young American, is assumed to be quite indolent in his reading habits. If he cannot have his reading spoon-fed, he wants none of it (Atlick, 1959, p. XVIII).

Mary Austin perhaps understates the case when she says, "The overall picture of the instruction in the teaching of critical reading . . . is far from encouraging (Austin, 1961, p. 50)." Hook may be more on target when he described various types of stereotyped literature teachers in his The Teaching of High School English. He sums up their incompetence and the reason for it:

> Perhaps all of them teach as they do for one central reason: They do not know how to read literature or why to read literature. More specifically, they do not know how to read a page and relate that page to other pages (Hook, 1959, pp. 119-122).

Considering the nature of literature, such a condemnation is severe. The ability to see the interrelationship of all the elements within a work is what is desired. It could be an attitude similar to Mr. Hook's that prompts Northrop Frye to write:

> What we have so far is, on one side of the 'study of literature,' the work of the scholar who tries to make it possible, and on the other side the work of the public critic who assumes that it exists. In between is 'literature' itself, a game preserve where the student wanders with his native intelligence his only guide (Frye, 1971, p. 10).

While it is not held that a knowledge of the process of critical reading will elevate this student to the rank of game warden, it is likely that such knowledge can at least give his wanderings direction. With it he may at least be able to identify some of the things in the preserve and come to understand why they are preserved.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Rationale for Using Children's Literature

Children's literature was selected as the medium through which the process of analytical criticism would be taught for a number of reasons.

"Critical reading is one of the least understood and most elusive of the reading skills and abilities (Stauffer, 1964)." This study was based on the belief that it would perhaps be best, from a teaching standpoint, to simplify the complex. The compactness of children's stories, it was felt, would enable the student and teacher to have a tight control over the entire text. Internal relationships among plot, character, setting, conflict, point of view, and tone could be seen and discussed more easily. However, brevity should not be confused with simplicity. ". . . children's literature is neither higher nor lower than adult literature. . . it involves aesthetic values and questions of form just as adult literature does (Smith, 1967, p. 8)." Frederick takes but 519 words in the telling, yet its subtlety of organization and profundity of theme make it ideally suited to instruction in the process of critical reading.

Hook writes that ". . . students improve in their reading ability by learning to distinguish tree from grove in whatever (italics mine) they read (Hook, 1959, p. 139)." There is evidence that in trying to find their way through The Scarlett Letter, Silas Marner, Moby Dick, and other such complex works many students get lost in the forest. It was felt that children's literature could give the students a method whereby they could at least begin to find a way out of the woods.

Another advantage in using children's stories was felt to lie in the principal objective of the study itself. If the emphasis of the unit were to be on the presentation of a method, a process, a handle the student could grasp, the fact that children's stories would be the subject of examination would constantly be reinforcing or reminding the student of the objective. It was felt that the subject matter itself could help eliminate the possibility of tangential subject matter confusing the issue. When reading Shakespeare or Melville much class time, of necessity, must be spent considering the implications of the ideas presented. That is to say, much class time is usually spent discussing "The Whiteness of the Whale," or the "whichness of what." Both the student and teacher are aware that with writers such as Melville they are dealing with deep unanswerable questions. With Lionni or Singer it was anticipated that the exact opposite would be true. This is not to say that Frederick and Zlateh the Goat have no significant themes. In truth, both works, in their own special ways, are quite profound. However, it was felt that in dealing with "children's stories" it would be reasonable to expect that everyone in class would be constantly aware that the "whichness of what" was not the main reason for reading the works. Therefore, it was felt that the students would be constantly cognizant of the fact that they were reading the works in order to become familiar with a method.

Procedures Used in Collecting and Treating Data

The first step in the field-test was selecting the students who would take part in it. They were all undergraduates enrolled in literature

classes at Lowell Technological Institute, an accredited four-year college located in Lowell, Massachusetts. Two groups were involved in the study, a target group and a control group. The target group received the pre-test and the post-test and the treatment, i.e., they studied the children's stories between the two tests. The control group was included in order to determine if there were any reactive effects to the taking of the pre-test. They received the pre-test and the post-test, but not the treatment. Instead of the children's stories, they studied the regular curriculum, i.e., adult literature, between the two tests.

At the first class meeting of the semester both groups were administered the pre-test. This test was limited to three areas: (1) it attempted to ascertain their attitude toward literature, (2) it attempted to ascertain their knowledge of literary terms, their knowledge of the elements of form with which literature works, and (3) it attempted to determine if the students possessed any method whereby they approached and evaluated a work of fiction.

Following the pre-test the students in the target group were exposed to a three-week classroom experience devoted to the examination of four children's stories from an analytical approach. The emphasis of the classroom experience was on the process of reading critically, according to the definition of critical reading as set forth in the study's definition of terms. Classroom emphasis was on student involvement in the act of analytical examination. The class was not a series of lectures, but rather a pre-practicum in critical reading. As much as possible of each of the class sessions was tape recorded. The tapes were reviewed following each

session so that the instructor could in some way monitor his classroom technique in order to guard against "teaching to the test" as it were. After the classroom experience with children's literature, the post-test was administered. The post-test was a repeat of the pre-test.

In the case of the control group much the same procedure was followed. During the first class session they were administered the pre-test. They were then exposed to a three-week unit made up of adult literature. The instructor for the control group was not the same as the instructor for the target group so there was no control over the particular type of classroom methodology used during the unit. The control group took the post-test on the same day as the target group. For both the target group and the control group both the pre-test and the post-test were the same. Each was given the same amount of time, one class hour.

The Instrument

The questions on the pre-test and the post-test were:

Part One: 1) Imagine that you are critically reading a book, that is, when you are finished you will make some judgments about its quality. What are the things that you might look at and consider to be important in determining the book's level of quality?

Part Two: 1) Do you like to read?

2) What book(s) have you read lately?

3) What else have you read lately? If you cannot remember the title of any book exactly, list either the approximate title or write a brief statement of what the book was about.

4) For each of the books that you have read recently, which of the books did you like?

5) For each of the books that you liked, why did you like it?

6) If there are no books that you liked which you read recently, name a book that you have read at any time and liked. Say why you liked it.

7) For each of the books that you have read recently, which of the books did you dislike?

8) For each of the books that you disliked, why did you dislike it?

9) If there are no books that you disliked which you read recently, name a book you have read at any time and disliked. Say why you disliked it.

10) If you said that you like to read and then said that you did not like one of the books that you read, does this mean that you did not like reading that book? Explain your answer.

Part Three: Define the following terms:

1) Form
2) Structure
3) Theme
4) Content
5) Plot
6) Character
7) Setting
8) Conflict
9) Point of View
10) Tone

Treatment of Data

The pre-tests and the post-tests were examined and one of four values was assigned to each response. A response could be positive, negative, neutral, or no response.

Preliminary to an explanation of how these values were assigned to each of the responses, it would seem important to restate the criteria for literary accuracy as defined in Chapter I for purposes of this inquiry:

Literary accuracy is here limited to those responses which are attributable to consideration of specified literary characteristics. Responses were assigned values in the light of this definition, which served to delineate favorable responses without accompanying conscious critical judgments from those predicated or deliberate application of analytical criteria (as prescribed in the design of this study). The same was true for negative responses. Rigorous application of the definition further served to eliminate "reading in" the reason for any given response. In doing so, it prompted in some instances the assignment of a value opposite that which might be given were there no criterion.

For example, if a student responded that a book must be, "interesting and have lots of action," in order to be considered a work of quality, this was viewed as a negative response in that it did not include any of the criteria of quality within the parameters of analytical criticism of the study design.

In another instance a student might say he liked a book because he was interested in the subject matter. Rosenblatt considered, the response

was still counted as negative. In one particular instance a student responded that he did not like Moby Dick because it was boring. Even though to him the answer was honest and positively truthful, it was still given a negative value. However, if the same student had said he disliked Melville's masterpiece because he was unable to cut through the subtlety of the arrangement of the elements of the work and, as a result, found it boring, the response would have been interpreted as positive. It would have had to have been positive because it would have indicated awareness of a measureable, operationable, objective method of evaluating the worth of a work on a basis other than personal reactions.

In the case of those questions that dealt with critical evaluation of literature and knowledge of literary terms a positive value was assigned if the answers fulfilled the criteria for literary accuracy as defined in Chapter I. If the answer contained none of these criteria, it was assigned a negative value. In the case of those responses where the answer was determined to be vague to the point where neither a positive nor a negative value could be reasonably assigned, the response was determined to have a neutral value. In the case of some of the answers which were initially determined to be vague, a review of all the other responses on that particular test sometimes shed enough light so that a positive or negative value could be assigned.

In the case of those questions that dealt with attitude toware literature, such as Part Two, question 4 ("For each of the books that you have read recently, which of the books did you like?"), if the student listed one book, the response was given a positive value. If the student stated

that he liked none of them, the response was given a negative value. If the student said that he liked some and not others or if he wrote that he wasn't sure or was vague in this fashion, his answer was given a neutral value. In all areas a blank answer was assigned a value of X, no response.

The results of the tests were approached in two ways. First, results of the entire test, i.e., all three areas with which the test dealt--criteria for evaluation, knowledge of terms, and attitude toward literature--were tabulated for each individual involved. (See Appendix I for the individual tests). This was done so that an overall picture of any general changes from pre-test to post-test could be seen.

However, the objectives of the study required further breakdown. The test was designed to measure three separate though related elements, attitude toward literature, knowledge of terms, and, most importantly for this inquiry, criteria for evaluation. Therefore, after the overall results were tabulated and examined, the tests were broken down into the groups of questions that dealt with these three areas. Questions that dealt with attitude were: Part Two; Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7. Questions that dealt with knowledge of literary terms were: Part Three, Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Questions that dealt with criteria for literary evaluation were: Part One, Question 1 and Part Two, Questions 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10. This breakdown into areas made it possible to explore possible relationships among the three categories.

The individual responses for every student for the entire test are

contained in Appendix I. The individual responses for every student broken down into the three areas with which the tests dealt are contained in Appendix II.

CHAPTER IV

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

The Overall Results

The following tables are the tabulated results of all of the members of the target group and the control group for both the pre-test and the post-test in relation to the overall scores attained on the entire test. (For the individual responses to the separate questions see Appendix I.)

An interpretation of the results of the test as a whole would seem to indicate value of further study of the efficacy of utilizing children's literature in teaching the process of analytical criticism. As Tables 1 and 2 show, the target group went from a pre-test mean score of 42.6 to a post-test mean score of 64.5, an increase of 21.9 points. In addition, as Tables 1 and 2 also indicate, the target group standard deviation changed from 17.525 on the pre-test to 9.871 on the post-test. This decrease of 7.654 points in standard deviation from pre-test to post-test on the part of the target group further reinforces the indication that more in-depth study in this area of children's literature may be of value.

The control group was designed to serve as a measure of possible reactive effect to the pre-test. As Tables 3 and 4 show, there is no indication of any positive reactive effect on the part of the control group. The control group mean score on the pre-test was 44.7. The control group mean score on the post-test was 43.0. This decrease of 1.7 points on the part of the control group mean score from pre-test to post-test indicates that there was no positive reactive effect to the pre-test, i.e., the pre-test did not teach itself to the control group. In addition, as

Table 1

TARGET GROUP

PRE-TEST

Test Number	Positive	Negative	Neutral	X	Questions Answered	Raw Score	Percent
A1	15	4	0	2	19	15/19	78.9
B1	4	7	8	2	19	4/19-2	19.0
C1	13	5	2	1	20	13/20-.5	64.5
E1	7	4	8	2	19	7/19-2	34.8
F1	11	7	1	2	19	11/19-.25	57.6
G1	7	8	3	3	18	7/18-.75	38.1
I1	4	12	3	2	19	4/19-.75	20.3
J1	8	8	2	3	18	8/18-.5	43.9
L1	9	8	1	3	18	9/18-.25	49.8
N1	9	5	4	3	18	9/18-1	49.0
O1	4	6	6	5	16	4/16-1.5	23.5
P1	6	9	2	4	17	6/17-.5	34.8
R1	8	11	1	1	20	8/20-.25	39.8

Mean = 42.6

Standard Deviation = 17.525

Table 2

TARGET GROUP

POST-TEST

Test Number	Positive	Negative	Neutral	X	Questions Answered	Raw Score	Percent
A1	15	3	0	3	18	15/18	83.3
B1	12	5	2	2	19	12/19-.5	62.6
C1	13	5	2	1	20	13/20-.5	64.5
E1	13	0	6	2	19	13/19-1.5	66.9
F1	14	2	3	2	19	14/19-.75	72.9
G1	14	2	2	3	18	14/18-.5	77.3
I1	11	5	1	4	17	11/17-.25	64.4
J1	15	1	2	3	18	15/18-.5	82.8
L1	9	7	2	3	18	9/18-.5	49.5
N1	14	1	4	2	19	14/19-1	72.6
O1	12	3	3	3	18	12/18-.75	66.0
P1	10	4	4	3	18	10/18-1	54.6
R1	14	6	0	1	20	14/20	70.0

Mean = 64.5

Standard Deviation = 9.871

Table 3

CONTROL GROUP

PRE-TEST

Test Number	Positive	Negative	Neutral	X	Questions Answered	Raw Score	Percent
1a	10	8	1	2	19	10/19-.25	52.4
3a	6	9	2	4	17	6/17-.5	34.8
4a	11	8	0	2	19	11/19	58.0
5a	8	11	1	1	20	8/20-.25	39.8
6a	9	10	0	2	19	9/19	47.3
7a	7	7	4	3	18	7/18-1	38.8
8a	9	9	1	2	19	9/19-.25	47.2
9a	8	7	1	5	16	8/16-.25	49.8
10a	4	6	1	6	15	4/15-.25	26.4
11a	6	5	2	8	13	6/13-.5	45.6
12a	8	8	2	3	18	8/18-.5	44.0
14a	10	8	1	2	19	10/19-.25	52.4
15a	6	7	2	6	15	6/15-.5	39.5
16a	7	9	2	3	18	7/18-.5	38.4
18a	10	7	1	3	18	10/18-.25	55.3
19a	11	6	2	2	19	11/19-.5	57.3
20a	9	5	4	3	18	9/18-1	49.0
21a	4	8	1	8	13	4/13-.25	30.6

Mean = 44.7

Standard Deviation = 9.08

Table 4

CONTROL GROUP

POST-TEST

Test Number	Positive	Negative	Neutral	X	Questions Answered	Raw Score	Percent
1a	11	7	1	2	19	11/19-.25	57.6
3a	8	8	1	4	17	8/17-.25	46.8
4a	11	7	1	2	19	11/19-.25	57.6
5a	5	12	1	3	18	5/18-.25	27.5
6a	8	10	0	3	18	8/18	44.5
7a	5	6	4	6	15	5/15-1	32.3
8a	11	7	1	2	19	11/19-.25	57.6
9a	8	5	3	5	16	8/16-.75	49.3
10a	2	6	3	6	15	2/15-.75	12.6
11a	7	7	2	5	16	7/16-.5	43.3
12a	8	7	3	3	18	8/18-.75	43.7
14a	10	8	1	2	19	10/19-.25	52.3
15a	1	7	4	9	13	1/13-1	6.7
16a	7	9	2	3	18	7/18-.5	38.4
18a	11	7	0	3	18	11/18	61.2
19a	10	7	1	3	18	10/18-.25	55.3
20a	11	4	1	5	16	11/16-.25	68.5
21a	5	7	2	7	14	5/14-.5	35.2

Mean = 43.0

Standard Deviation = 16.29

Tables 3 and 4 also show, the control group standard deviation changed from 9.08 on the pre-test to 16.29 on the post-test. This increase of 7.21 points in standard deviation from pre-test to post-test for the control group further indicates that there was no positive reactive effect to the test; on the contrary, this increase in standard deviation suggests a negative reactive effect to the test.

This possibility of a negative reactive effect on the part of the control group raises some considerations that should be mentioned here. The two groups were not arranged in an experimental situation with all the controls that such a circumstance would necessitate. External factors could have contributed to the standard deviation increase of the control group from pre-test to post-test.

For example, the members of the target group were aware that they were involved in a field-test that dealt with children's literature. After all, they were reading about Frederick, the field mouse, in a college literature class. A safe assumption would be that such subject matter is seldom encountered in such an environment. The novelty factor of working with such subject matter may have contributed to the target group's approaching the post-test with more enthusiasm than the control group. Throughout the treatment the majority of the members of the target group did seem to be genuinely enthusiastic with the treatment itself. They spoke their approval of this method of approaching literature frequently, both during and after the treatment period. One student in the target group volunteered this comment at the end of Question 10 on his post-test. The student was N1:

> So far this course has done more to awaken me than to teach me. I've endured 12 years of English and known more or less the elements of well-written literature. However, I was never taught how to use this knowledge and I appreciate this new insight. It's not possible to say if I will really continue to read in the true sense or just "look at the words," but I know that it would be a waste if I didn't make use of the knowledge acquired. I feel that through the analization (sic) of a book or whatever, that I will gain more for myself and a greater appreciation of the talents of the author. The use of children's books made this process of learning much simpler.

In the case of the control group obviously there could be no such involvement; the treatment was missing. At the time of the post-test one member of the control group was heard saying something to the effect, "This again? What do we have to take this again for (sic)? It doesn't count, does it?"

An examination of Table 5 shows some further indication of the possibility of a negative reactive effect in the control group. Regarding the total number of positive responses for the entire test, the target group had 105 on the pre-test and 166 on the post-test, an increase of 61 positive responses. The control group had 143 positive responses on the pre-test and 139 on the post-test. Considering the questions asked on the test, it is unlikely that the number of positive responses should decrease for any group; yet the control group from pre-test to post-test had a decrease of 4 positive responses.

The same situation exists in the case of neutral responses. On the pre-test the target group had 41 neutral responses. On the post-test they had 31 neutral responses, a decrease of 10. On the pre-test the control group had 28 neutral responses. On the post-test they had 31 neutral

Table 5

TARGET GROUP		Pre-Test	Post-Test	
	Positive	105	166	+61
	Negative	94	44	-50
	Neutral	41	31	-10
	X	33	32	-01
CONTROL GROUP		Pre-Test	Post-Test	
	Positive	143	139	-04
	Negative	138	122	-16
	Neutral	28	31	+03
	X	65	73	+08

responses, an increase of 3. At this point it would seem advisable to reiterate the criteria by which values were assigned to responses. In the case of those questions that dealt with critical evaluation of literature and knowledge of literary terms a positive value was assigned if the answer fulfilled the criteria for literary accuracy as defined in Chapter I. If the answer contained none of these criteria, it was assigned a negative value. In the case of those responses where the answer was determined to be vague to the point where neither a positive nor a negative value could be reasonably assigned, the response was determined to be neutral. In the case of some of the answers which were initially determined to be vague, a review of all the other responses on that particular test sometimes indicated that the vague response was simply couched in terms that did not accurately reflect the knowledge of the student as shown on the other responses. In other words, if a response seemed to be vague, and therefore neutral when examined alone, it could be seen as positive or negative when examined in relation to all the other responses on the test. It is possible that the increase in neutral responses in the control group from pre-test to post-test indicates that there were some members of the control group who were not intent on answering the questions to the degree that they were at the time of the pre-test.

In the area of no response a similar situation occurred. The target group had 33 blank answers on the pre-test and 32 blank answers on the post-test, a decrease of only one, but nonetheless a decrease. The control group had 65 blank answers on the pre-test and 73 blank answers on the post-test, an increase of 8 negative responses. Considering the nature of

the questions asked on the test, questions that dealt with attitude toward literature and possession of a methodology for evaluating literature objectively, this increase in no response answers for the control group from pre-test to post-test further supports the possibility that there was some negative reactive effect to taking the tests.

The only area of testing where this decrease in positive response and increase in neutral and no response might be explained is in the area of knowledge of literary terms which may have been forgotten during the period from pre-test to post-test. However, during the period from pre-test to post-test the control group improved their scores in knowledge of literary terms. (An exact breakdown of the specific data in this area is included in the following section of this chapter which deals with the breakdown of the test results into the three areas with which the test dealt.)

The control group showed improvement from pre-test to post-test only in one area, knowledge of literary terms. That they would improve in this area is reasonable. The members of the control group were engaged in studying literature between the time of the pre-test and the post-test. Part of their study dealt with knowledge of literary terms. The control group's lack of improvement in the other areas as well as their increase in number of neutral responses and no responses could lead one to conclude that there was some negative reactive effect to the test. What is more, even though the control group did show improvement in the area of knowledge of literary terms, the target group improved proportionally more in this area from pre-test to post-test.

One possible conclusion that could be drawn from these results is that the target group had a positive reactive effect to the pre-test. However, in light of all the data available this conclusion seems unlikely. For the entire pre-test the target group had a mean score of 42.6, while the control group had a mean score of 44.7. If the increase in mean score for the target group at post-test was solely attributable to a positive reactive effect, there should have been at least a minimal increase for the control group.

Another possibility is that there was some negative reaction on the part of the control group to their instructor. However, the instructor for the control group reported that the class seemed to enjoy the course and that she could detect no hostility toward her as an instructor. (It should also be noted here that the instructor for the control group has consistently ranked among the highest in the department on student evaluations.) She also reported that while there was no obvious hostility toward her or the course, neither was there any obvious enthusiasm for the subject matter on the part of the control group. This is a situation that both the instructors for the control group and the target group have observed to be the normal reaction of students in literature classes at Lowell Technological Institute. Classes in literature at the Institute are made up of Business Administration majors, Chemical Engineering majors, Nuclear Physics majors, Electrical Engineering majors, and Biology majors. There appears to be, on the part of most of the students, a general acceptance that literature classes must be borne because they are required for graduation. It appears that intense enthusiasm for and involvement

in the study of literature are not the general rule at Lowell Technological Institute.

This lack of enthusiasm was also noted to be present by the instructor of the target group at the time of the pre-test and in the first few class sessions that followed. Students were somewhat reluctant to offer contributions in class and voice their opinions regarding literature. However, as they began to understand why they were studying children's literature, this situation reversed. In most cases classroom contributions on the part of the students increased, and they seemed to become genuinely involved with the study of the works. At the end of the course it was the concensus of the members of the target group that the children's literature had been productive from their point of view. Though the "fun factor" was not really considered when the study was designed, during the course of the field-test and after the field-test it was observed to become more and more prevalent in relation to motivating the students. They seemed to simply enjoy working with the children's books. At the end of the course the members of the target group unanimously indicated their desire that the instructor offer an elective course devoted exclusively to the study of children's literature the following semester.

Considering the overall results of the pre-tests and post-tests for both groups and the observed positive reaction of the target group to the treatment, it would seem that children's literature is worthy of more investigation as a positive method of teaching. An examination of the results of the pre-tests and post-tests, when broken down into the three areas which the test was designed to ascertain, reinforces this conclusion.

Separate Area Results

The following are the tabulated results for the target group and the control group for the pre-tests and the post-tests broken down into the three separate areas which the test was designed to ascertain, i.e., attitude toward literature, knowledge of literary terms, and criteria for objective evaluation of a work. For the individual responses to the questions in each of these categories see Appendix II. An examination of the results of the pre-tests and post-tests when broken down into the three areas with which the test was concerned would seem to lend further support to the positive indications of the overall test results, that children's literature at least merits more investigation as a possibly effective teaching tool.

In the area of attitude toward literature, as Table 6 shows, the target group had a pre-test mean score of 72.25 and a post-test mean score of 89.2, an increase of 16.95 points. The standard deviation for the target group in the area of attitude toward literature was 32 on the pre-test and 12.31 on the post-test, a decrease of 19.68 points. It is interesting to note that though these results are of a positive nature, it was in the area of attitude that the tests showed the least change from pre-test to post-test for the target group. It was hoped on the part of this investigator that an increased knowledge of criteria for evaluation would produce a corresponding increased positive attitude toward the subject. What is more, this anticipated increase was observed to take place in class. Yet in the test results attitude increase was proportionally lower than in other areas. One reason for this could be the

Table 6

TARGET GROUP

ATTITUDE

PRE-TEST	Mean 72.25	STD 32					
Test No.	Positive	Negative	Neutral	X	Questions Answered	Raw Score	Percent
A1	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
B1	4	0	1	0	5	4/5-.25	79.8
C1	4	0	0	1	4	4/4	100
E1	3	2	0	0	5	3/5	60
F1	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
G1	2	0	2	1	4	2/4-.5	49.5
I1	1	3	1	0	5	1/5-.25	19.8
J1	4	0	0	1	4	4/4	100
L1	4	0	0	1	4	4/4	100
N1	3	1	0	1	4	3/4	75
O1	0	1	3	1	4	0/4-.75	0
P1	3	1	0	1	4	3/4	75
R1	4	1	0	0	5	4/5	80
POST-TEST	Mean 89.2	STD 12.31					
A1	3	0	0	2	3	3/3	100
B1	4	0	1	0	5	4/5-.25	79.8
C1	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
E1	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
F1	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
G1	3	0	1	1	4	3/4-.25	74.8
I1	3	0	0	2	3	3/3	100
J1	4	0	0	1	4	4/4	100
L1	3	0	1	1	4	3/4-.25	74.8
N1	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
O1	3	0	1	1	4	3/4-.25	74.8
P1	3	0	0	1	4	3/4-.25	74.8
R1	4	1	0	0	5	4/5	80

test instrument itself. Perhaps the types of questions asked in the area of attitude were such that a dramatic change from pre-test to post-test would be unlikely in most instances. However, even though minimal, the findings were positive for the target group. In the case of the control group the opposite occurred.

As Tables 7 and 8 show, the control group had in the area of attitude a pre-test mean score of 86.7 and a post-test mean score of 77.5, a decrease of 9.2 points. The standard deviation for the control group in the area of attitude toward literature was 24.4 on the pre-test and 32.17 on the post-test, an increase of 7.77 points. This increase in standard deviation and decrease in the mean score from pre-test to post-test in attitude for the control group further supports the conclusion that there may have been some negative reactive effect to the taking of the tests.

Another possibility to consider is that the treatment of children's literature which the target group received contributed to their performing positively in the area of attitude while the control group which did not receive the treatment performed negatively.

In the area of knowledge of literary terms, as Table 9 shows, the target group had a mean score of 43.0 on the pre-test and a mean score of 62.75 on the post-test, an increase of 20.25 points. The standard deviation for the target group in the area of knowledge of literary terms was 17.23 on the pre-test and 12 on the post-test, a decrease of 5.23 points. Here the mean score increase is significantly more than in the area of attitude, and again the scores seem to support the theory that children's literature can possibly be of use in the instruction of literature.

Table 7

CONTROL GROUP

ATTITUDE

PRE-TEST	Mean 86.70		STD 24.40				
Test No.	Positive	Negative	Neutral	X	Questions Answered	Raw Score	Percent
1a	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
3a	3	0	0	2	3	3/3	100
4a	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
5a	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
6a	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
7a	3	0	1	1	4	3/4-.25	74.8
8a	4	0	1	0	5	4/5-.25	79.8
9a	4	0	0	1	4	4/4	100
10a	2	0	0	3	2	2/2	100
11a	3	0	0	2	3	3/3	100
12a	3	0	1	1	4	3/4-.25	74.8
14a	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
15a	3	0	1	1	4	3/4-.25	74.8
16a	3	0	1	1	4	3/4-.25	74.8
18a	4	0	0	1	4	4/4	100
19a	4	0	1	0	5	4/5-.25	79.8
20a	4	0	0	1	4	4/4	100
21a	0	2	1	2	3	0/3-.25	0

Table 8

CONTROL GROUP

ATTITUDE

POST-TEST Mean 77.50 STD 32.17

Test No.	Positive	Negative	Neutral	X	Questions Answered	Raw Score	Percent
1a	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
3a	3	0	0	2	3	3/3	100
4a	4	0	1	0	5	4/5-.25	79.8
5a	2	1	1	1	4	2/4-.25	49.8
6a	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
7a	2	0	1	2	3	2/3-.25	66.5
8a	4	0	1	0	5	4/5-.25	79.8
9a	3	0	0	2	3	3/3	100
10a	1	0	0	4	1	1/1	100
11a	2	0	1	2	3	2/3-.25	66.5
12a	3	0	1	1	4	3/4-.25	74.8
14a	5	0	0	0	5	5/5	100
15a	0	0	2	3	2	0/2-.5	0
16a	4	0	0	1	4	4/4	100
18a	3	0	0	2	3	3/3	100
19a	3	0	1	1	4	3/4-.25	74.8
20a	3	0	0	2	3	3/3	100
21a	0	2	1	2	3	0/3-.25	0

Table 9

TARGET GROUP

TERMS

PRE-TEST Mean 43.0 STD 17.23

Test No.	Positive	Negative	Neutral	X	Questions Answered	Raw Score	Percent
A1	6	4	0	0	10	6/10	60
B1	0	4	6	0	10	0/10-1.5	0
C1	7	2	1	0	10	7/10-.25	69.8
E1	4	0	6	0	10	4/10-1.5	38.5
F1	6	4	0	0	10	6/10	60
G1	4	5	0	1	9	4/9	44.5
I1	3	5	2	0	10	3/10-.5	29.5
J1	4	4	2	0	10	4/10-.5	39.5
L1	5	5	0	0	10	5/10	50
N1	5	2	3	0	10	5/10-.75	49.3
O1	4	2	3	1	9	4/9-.75	43.8
P1	3	4	2	1	9	3/9-.5	32.8
R1	4	6	0	0	10	4/10	40

POST-TEST Mean 62.75 STD 12.00

A1	8	2	0	0	10	8/10	80
B1	6	3	1	0	10	6/10-.25	59.8
C1	7	2	1	0	10	7/10-.25	69.8
E1	6	0	4	0	10	6/10-1	59
F1	7	2	1	0	10	7/10-.25	69.8
G1	8	1	1	0	10	8/10-.25	79.8
I1	6	3	1	0	10	6/10-.25	59.8
J1	7	1	2	0	10	7/10-.5	69.5
L1	5	5	0	0	10	5/10	50
N1	5	1	4	0	10	5/10-1	49
O1	6	2	2	0	10	6/10-.5	59.5
P1	4	3	3	0	10	4/10-.75	39.3
R1	7	3	0	0	10	7/10	70

In the area of knowledge of literary terms, as Tables 10 and 11 show, the control group had a mean score of 45.0 on the pre-test and a mean score of 46.6 on the post-test, an increase of only 1.6 points. The standard deviation for the control group in the area of knowledge of literary terms was 5.89 on the pre-test and 13.78 on the post-test, an increase of 7.89 points.

As in the case of the other areas thus far examined, here again the results of the target group are superior to those of the control group. What contributes to the possible significance of the results is that both groups were exposed to literary terms in their respective classes and both groups were only two points apart on their pre-test mean scores, and their standard deviations in this area were the closest for any area of the test. In addition, the control group scores for both the mean and the standard deviation were better than those of the target group on the pre-test. Why then did the target group improve so drastically in this area while the control group did not?

One possible answer may lie in the fact that there was a negative reactive effect to the test on the part of the control group. But if this were the cause, why then was there no reactive effect of the same nature for the target group? Another possible reason for the target group's improvement may lie in the methodology employed in the classroom during the treatment.

The purpose of the study was to investigate the possible efficacy of utilizing children's literature as a possible means of instruction in the process of analytical criticism. As a part of this study it was deemed

Table 10

CONTROL GROUP

TERMS

PRE-TEST Mean 45.0 STD 11.68

Test No.	Positive	Negative	Neutral	X	Questions Answered	Raw Score	Percent
1a	5	4	1	0	10	5/10-.25	49.8
3a	3	6	1	0	10	3/10-.25	29.8
4a	6	4	0	0	10	6/10	60
5a	3	6	1	0	10	3/10-.75	29.3
6a	4	5	0	1	9	4/9	44.5
7a	4	3	3	0	10	4/10-.75	39.3
8a	6	4	0	0	10	6/10	60
9a	4	3	1	2	8	4/8-.25	49.8
10a	2	3	1	0	10	2/10-.25	19.8
11a	3	2	2	3	7	3/7-.5	42.5
12a	5	4	1	0	10	5/10-.25	49.8
14a	5	4	1	0	10	5/10-.25	49.8
15a	3	5	1	1	9	3/9-.25	33.0
16a	4	5	1	0	10	4/10-.25	39.8
18a	6	3	1	0	10	6/10-.25	59.8
19a	6	3	1	0	10	6/10-.25	59.8
20a	5	2	3	0	10	5/10-.75	49.3
21a	4	5	0	1	9	4/9	44.5

Table 11

CONTROL GROUP

TERMS

POST-TEST Mean 46.60 STD 18.97

Test No.	Positive	Negative	Neutral	X	Questions Answered	Raw Score	Percent
1a	6	3	1	0	10	6/10-.25	59.8
3a	5	5	0	0	10	5/10	50
4a	7	3	0	0	10	7/10	70
5a	3	7	0	0	10	3/10	30
6a	3	6	0	1	9	3/9	33.4
7a	3	3	3	1	9	3/9-.75	32.7
8a	7	3	0	0	10	7/10	70
9a	5	2	3	0	10	5/10-.75	49.3
10a	1	2	3	0	10	1/10-.75	9.3
11a	5	3	1	1	9	5/9-.25	55.8
12a	5	3	2	0	10	5/10-.5	49.5
14a	5	4	1	0	10	5/10-.25	49.8
15a	1	6	2	1	9	1/9-.5	10.6
16a	3	5	2	0	10	3/10-.5	29.5
18a	7	3	0	0	10	7/10	70
19a	5	5	0	0	10	5/10	50
20a	7	2	1	0	10	7/10-.25	69.8
21a	5	4	1	0	10	5/10-.25	49.8

necessary to familiarize the subjects of the field-test with a knowledge of literary terms if such a knowledge was lacking in any degree sufficient enough to impair their ability to critically analyze a work. Nonetheless, it was never the intention of the investigator to tell the subjects of the field-test what he thought they should know in any area. One of the basic premises on which the study was based, one of the reasons why it was devised, was the belief that a student can learn more when he engages himself as much as possible in the teaching process and the learning process. This investigator speculated that in relation to the subject of analytical criticism, such student involvement would be facilitated through the use of something simple with which the student could get involved on his own terms rather than listening to a lecture about the intricacies of a great work. What was in no way desired was a harangue from the instructor regarding those definitions that he felt the students "must" know. With this in mind, the instructor of the target group during the field-test avoided "telling" or lecturing as much as was possible. Emphasis in classroom discussion was on just that--discussion. Silent and non-verbal cues were used extensively.

Contrastingly, the instructor for the control group reported that the lecture method was employed as the principal method of teaching literary terms to the control group. One of the possible reasons for the target group's improvement from pre-test to post-test may be that in the classroom discussion and clarification of literary terms the members of the target group did more of the defining and clarifying themselves than did the control group. If such were the case, this may have contributed

to the target group's scores contrasting with the scores of the control group.

Another possible reason for the target group's improvement in the area of knowledge of literary terms may lie in the area of criteria for literary criticism. It must be remembered why knowledge of literary terms was included. The main thrust of the study dealt with the analytical criticism of literature. It was the belief of the investigator that it would be easier for the students to engage in discussion of a subject matter if they were familiar with the terminology of that subject matter. In order for them to analytically criticize literature, it was assumed that they would have to understand literary terms. If this assumption on the part of the instructor is in any way valid, it could help explain why the target group improved in knowledge of literary terms as they did. The members of the target group were observed to become increasingly interested in the children's stories as the field-test progressed. It may have been that their interest in analytically criticizing the works provided another additional motivational factor which contributed to their increased scores from pre-test to post-test in the area of knowledge of literary terms. It may have been that the treatment caused the students of the target group to get involved in criticism to a degree where they wished to learn more about the terms of criticism and did. Here again is another situation where it is possible that the treatment, the use of children's literature, contributed to improvement in the target group's scores from pre-test to post-test.

The final area for examination is the most important in relation to the purpose of the study, and it was in this area, the criteria for critical evaluation, that the target group showed the most improvement. Here, as Table 12 shows, the target group had a mean score of 13.65 on the pre-test and a mean score of 62.2 on the post-test, an increase of 48.55 points. The standard deviation for the target group in the area of criteria for critical evaluation was 28.38 on the pre-test and 24.97 on the post-test, a decrease of 3.41 points.

These results are sufficient enough to at the very least indicate that further research in this area is something not to be discounted lightly. According to these test results there was a significant improvement in the members of the target group's ability to evaluate objectively a work of literature from pre-test to post-test.

In the case of the control group, no such improvement took place. Tables 13 and 14 show the control group had a mean score of 1.39 on the pre-test and a mean score of 4.63 on the post-test, an increase of only 3.24 points in this area of criteria for evaluation. The standard deviation for the control group in this area was 5.89 on the pre-test and 13.78 on the post-test, an increase of 7.89 points.

One factor which could help to explain the marked disparity between the performances of the two groups could be the mean scores at the time of pre-test. It was only in the area of critical criteria that the target group scored higher than the control group on the pre-test. It is possible that their mean score of 13.65 in this area at pre-test helped account

Table 12

TARGET GROUP

CRITERIA

PRE-TEST Mean 13.65 STD 28.38

Test No.	Positive	Negative	Neutral	X	Questions Answered	Raw Score	Percent
A1	4	0	0	2	4	4/4	100
B1	0	3	1	2	4	0/4-.25	0
C1	2	3	1	0	6	2/6-.25	33
E1	0	2	2	2	4	0/4-.5	0
F1	0	3	1	2	4	0/4-.25	0
G1	1	3	1	1	5	1/5-.25	19.8
I1	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
J1	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
L1	0	3	1	2	4	0/4-.25	0
N1	1	2	1	2	4	1/4-.25	24.8
O1	0	3	0	3	3	0/3	0
P1	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
R1	0	4	1	1	5	0/5-.25	0

POST-TEST Mean 62.2 STD 24.97

A1	4	1	0	1	5	4/5	80
B1	2	2	0	2	4	2/4	50
C1	1	3	1	1	5	1/5-.25	19.8
E1	2	0	2	2	4	2/4-.5	49.5
F1	2	0	2	2	4	2/4-.5	49.5
G1	3	1	0	2	4	3/4	75
I1	2	2	0	2	4	2/4	50
J1	4	0	0	2	4	4/4	100
L1	1	2	1	2	4	1/4-.25	24.8
N1	4	0	0	2	4	4/4	100
O1	3	1	0	2	4	3/4	75
P1	3	1	0	2	4	3/4	75
R1	3	2	0	1	5	3/5	60

Table 13

CONTROL GROUP

CRITERIA

PRE-TEST Mean 1.39 STD 5.89

Test No.	Positive	Negative	Neutral	X	Questions Answered	Raw Score	Percent
1a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
3a	0	3	1	2	4	0/4	0
4a	0	4	0	2	0	0/4	0
5a	0	5	0	1	5	0/5	0
6a	0	5	0	1	5	0/5	0
7a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
8a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
9a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
10a	0	3	0	3	3	0/3	0
11a	0	3	0	3	3	0/3	0
12a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
14a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
15a	0	2	0	4	2	0/2	0
16a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
18a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
19a	1	3	0	2	4	1/4	25
20a	0	3	1	2	4	0/4	0
21a	0	1	0	5	1	0/1	0

Table 14

CONTROL GROUP

CRITERIA

POST-TEST Mean 4.63 STD 13.78

Test No.	Positive	Negative	Neutral	X	Questions Answered	Raw Score	Percent
1a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
3a	0	3	1	2	4	0/4	0
4a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
5a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
6a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
7a	0	3	0	3	3	0/3	0
8a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
9a	0	3	0	3	3	0/3	0
10a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
11a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
12a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
14a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
15a	0	1	0	5	1	0/1	0
16a	0	4	0	2	4	0/4	0
18a	0	4	0	2	0	0/4	0
19a	2	2	0	2	4	2/4	50
20a	1	2	0	3	3	1/3	33.4
21a	0	1	0	5	1	0/1	1

for their performing considerably better than the control group which had a pre-test mean score of only 1.39 in this area. The members of the target group may have had an edge on the members of the control group. This edge may have provided a background necessary for improvement in this area. The members of the target group had a mean score that indicated an almost non-existent knowledge of criteria for criticism at pre-test. However, even if such were the case, the target group did improve dramatically over their own pre-test score, indicating that the treatment had some positive effect.

A brief examination of all three areas further supports the contention that the treatment, the study of children's literature, may be a productive teaching tool in a literature classroom. The target group's attitude toward literature changed the least from pre-test to post-test. In knowledge of literary terms the target group improved considerably more than in attitude, and in the area of criteria for criticism, the target group improved the most. The control group's scores failed to improve at all in the area of attitude. Their improvement in knowledge of literary terms was almost negligible, 1.6 points in the mean, as was their improvement in criteria for evaluation, an increase of only 3.24 points for the mean.

The group that received the treatment improved in all three areas of the test. The group that did not receive the treatment improved in two areas, but only minimally. Their failure to improve in the area of attitude could indicate a possible negative reactive effect to the taking of the test, as could their minimal improvements in the other areas. However, there is no indication that the improvement of the target group could be

solely attributable to a positive reactive effect. The results of the field-test indicate that the treatment, the study of children's literature, is at least worthy of further investigation as a possibly effective tool in the instruction of the process of critical reading.

Results of the pre- and post-tests for both groups in the categories of attitude, knowledge of terms, and criteria for evaluation break down as follows:

Table 15

		Target Group		Control Group	
		Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude					
	Positive	42	50	65	52
	Negative	9	1	2	3
	Neutral	7	5	7	10
	X	7	9	16	25
Terms					
	Positive	55	82	78	83
	Negative	47	28	71	69
	Neutral	25	20	19	20
	X	3	0	8	4
Criteria					
	Positive	8	34	1	3
	Negative	38	15	64	59
	Neutral	9	6	2	1
	X	23	23	41	45

Table 16

		TARGET GROUP		CONTROL GROUP
ATTITUDE				
Mean Score	Pre-Test	72.25	Pre-Test	86.7
	Post-Test	98.2	Post-Test	77.5
ATTITUDE				
STD	Pre-Test	32	Pre-Test	24.40
	Post-Test	12.31	Post-Test	32.17
TERMS				
Mean Score	Pre-Test	43.0	Pre-Test	45.0
	Post-Test	62.75	Post-Test	46.6
TERMS				
STD	Pre-Test	17.23	Pre-Test	11.68
	Post-Test	12	Post-Test	18.97
CRITERIA				
Mean Score	Pre-Test	13.65	Pre-Test	1.39
	Post-Test	62.2	Post-Test	4.63
CRITERIA				
STD	Pre-Test	28.38	Pre-Test	5.89
	Post-Test	24.97	Post-Test	13.78

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

In an investigation of this type it is very difficult to reach hard and fast conclusions. A behavioral study, by definition, is elusive; and a behavioral study dealing with subject matter as elusive as literature can be evasive. This investigation was designed with these aspects of educational research and literature in mind. All that was attempted here was a field-test which could serve as a first probing into a new area, using children's literature as a means of teaching a relatively sophisticated process of reading adult literature. The field-test, naturally, did not employ the rigorous controls that an experiment would have demanded. However, in the context of the field-test as it was designed and implemented, the results were significant enough to be supportive of the basic theory regarding children's literature, i.e., it seems to work.

At the very least, the results of the field-test indicate that the treatment was successful here. At best, these results indicate that the subject is worthy of more detailed research. If the study is replicated in any way, some procedural changes are recommended so that the results of such research may have more validity.

First, the instrument itself should be examined and hopefully improved. Here the pre-test and post-test were designed by the investigator with the assistance of Dr. Thomas Hutchinson of the Research Center of the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts. Here the essay question was used. The indication of some possible negative reactive effect on

the part of the control group on the post-test could have been a reaction to this type of test. Perhaps a multiple choice test could assure total objectivity in evaluating the responses on the tests.

If experimentation is carried out, naturally the investigator should have no involvement with the instruction of either group. No matter how earnest he is in his attempts to remain objective, an investigator who administers the treatment in a case such as this is always in danger of "teaching to the test" as it were. Eliminating the investigator from involvement in the field-test eliminates this possibility.

It is also strongly recommended that this subject be experimented with at the secondary level. If the theory is indeed valid, high school students stand to gain the most from it. After all, many high school students do not go on to higher education. Many receive no further training in the liberal arts than is provided by the twelfth grade. If the study of children's literature can help provide high school students with a process of reading and evaluating a work of literature, then such study should be developed.

If the study is replicated at the college level, it would perhaps be worthwhile to discover what differences, if any, occur when it is administered at a liberal arts institution. In this field-test all of the subjects in both the target group and the control group were students in areas other than liberal arts. A positive improvement from pre-test to post-test with students majoring in liberal arts or literature would be significant in determining the value of the treatment.

Another area which a future investigator may wish to examine and

perhaps alter is the selection of the children's books used in the field-test. In this study the books used were chosen because the investigator believed that they exhibited those characteristics of fine literature as set forth in Chapter I. Also, the books in this study were all by acknowledged craftsmen in the field of literature. A future study might wish to deal with different works so that the efficacy of using children's literature in general and not just these specific pieces of that genre will be further tested.

If any of the works used in this study are used again, it is recommended that Ionesco's Story Number 1 not be one of them. Story Number 1 was selected for use here because it exhibits those characteristics of the absurd for which Ionesco is so well known. The rationale for this was as follows: If the students did succeed in developing a grasp of what is entailed in the process of critical reading and did have some success in analyzing the first three stories, then perhaps they could refine these skills by dealing with something that appeared to have no form whatever. It was hoped that the students would attempt to get into Ionesco's mad story about Josette and in doing so be forced to consider the relationship between theme and form on a different, more involved level. However, all observations indicate that this was not what happened. The majority of the students seemed to dislike the story because of its absurd nature. They seemed to be more comfortable practicing their critical skills on works that conformed to a more conventional standard of structure. The majority of students in the target group listed Story Number 1 among those books that they said they disliked on the post-test. The reason most

often given for this dislike was that the work had a form that seemed to be without rational structure.

The final recommendation that this investigator would make takes the form of a wish more than a research recommendation--anyone who chooses to continue investigation into the use of children's literature as a teaching tool should, it is hoped, enjoy the process of the study itself. The investigator found that working with Frederick, the field mouse, and Zlateh, the goat, had a "fun factor" for himself as well as for the students. Perhaps working with Digger Dan the Steamshovel man or other characters out of the world of children's literature can be equally enjoyable for all concerned, and benefit the study of English Education and, most importantly, the students in the bargain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atlick, Richard D. Preface to Critical Reading. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1959.

Austin, Mary C. The Torch Lighters. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Barnet, S., & Berman, M., & Burto, W. A Dictionary of Literary Terms. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1960.

Bate, Walter J. ed. Criticism: The Major Texts. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1952.

Booth, Wayne C. The Rhetoric of Fiction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Brooks, C. & Purser, J., & Warren, R. P. An Approach To Literature. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952.

Burton, Dwight L. Literature Study In The High Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Company, 1961.

Cantor, Nathaniel. Dynamics of Learning. Buffalo, New York: Henry Stewart, Incorporated, 1961.

Cooper, Lane. Aristotle on the Art of Poetry, An Amplified Version With Supplementary Illustrations. Ithaca, New York: Great Seal Books, 1962.

Daiches, David. Critical Approaches To Literature. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.

Earnest, E. A Forward To Literature. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Incorporated, 1945.

Fowler, M. E. Teaching Language, Composition, and Literature. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

Forster, E. M. Aspects of the Novel. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1954.

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1971.

Gordon, W. K. ed. Literature In Critical Perspectives: An Anthology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Hillocks, G. & McCabe, B. J., & McCampbell, J. F. The Dynamics of English Instruction Grades 7 - 12. New York: Random House, 1971.

Hook, J. N. The Teaching of High School English. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1959.

Ionesco, Eugene. Story Number 1. New York: Harlin Quist, Incorporated, 1967.

Jacobs, J. The Fables of Aesop. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941.

Jarrell, Randall. The Bat-Poet. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965.

Jenkinson, E. B., & Hawley, J. S., ed. On Teaching Literature Essays For Secondary School Teachers. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1967.

Lamson, R., & Smith, H., & Maclean, H. N., & Douglas, W. The Critical Reader. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1962.

Lemon, Lee T. Approaches to Literature A Guide To Thinking And Writing. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Lesser, Simon O. Fiction And The Unconscious. New York: Vintage Books, 1957.

Lionni, Leo. Frederick. New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.

Loban, W., & Ryan, M., & Squires, J. R. Teaching Language And Literature Grades Seven - Twelve. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1969.

Lubbock, Percy. The Craft of Fiction. New York: The Viking Press, 1957.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. Teaching Tips A Guidebook For the Beginning College Teacher. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1969.

Mirrielees, Lucia B. Teaching Composition And Literature In Junior and Senior High School. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1952.

Moffett, James. Teaching The Universe of Discourse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Morsey, Royal J. Improving English Instruction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.

Murphy, Geraldine. The Study of Literature in High School. Waltham, Massachusetts: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1968.

Ransom, John Crow. The World's Body. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: State University Press, 1968.

Report of the Commission on English College Entrance Examination Board, Freedom and Discipline in English. New York: 1965.

Richards, I. A. Practical Criticism. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1929.

Roberts, W. R., & Bywater, I. The Rhetoric And the Poetics Of Aristotle. New York: The Modern Library, 1954.

Rohrberger, M., & Woods, S. H., Jr., & Dukore, B. F. An Introduction To Literature. New York: Random House, 1968.

Rosenblatt, Louise M. Literature As Exploration. New York: Noble and Noble, Publishers, Inc., 1968.

Scholes, Robert. Elements of Fiction. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Scholes, Robert. ed. Approaches to the Novel. San Francisco, California: Chandler Publishing Company, 1966.

Scott, Wilbur S. Five Approaches of Literary Criticism. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963.

Singer, Isaac Bashevis. Zlateh The Goat And Other Stories. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.

Smith, James S. A Critical Approach To Children's Literature. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Stallman, Robert W. selected by. Critiques and Essays in Criticism 1920 - 1948. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1949.

Stauffer, Donald A. ed. The Intent of The Critic. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1941.

Stauffer, Russell G. compiler of. Dimensions Of Critical Reading. Proceedings of the Annual Education and Reading Conference held at the University of Delaware March 1-2, and March 6-7, 1964, Vol. XI, University of Delaware, 1964.

Thrall, W. & Hibbard, A. & Holman, H. A Handbook To Literature. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1961.

Williams, Raymond. Reading and Criticism. London: Frederick Muller, 1966.

APPENDIX I

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES
TO OVERALL TEST

SYMBOLS: Positive Response = Pos.
Negative Response = Neg.
Neutral Response = Neut.
No Response = X

- -

Experimental Class

A1

		Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Pos.	Pos.
Part Two		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. X	Neg.
		7. Pos.	X
		8. Pos.	X
		9. X	Pos.
		10. Pos.	Pos.
Part Three		1. Neg.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Pos.	Pos.
		10. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	15	15
	Neg.	4	3
	Neut.	0	0
	X	2	3

	B1	Pre-Test	Post-Test	C1	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Neg.	Pos.		1. Neut.	Neut.
Part Two		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Neut.	Pos.		3. X	Pos.
		4. Pos.	Neut.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Neg.		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. X	X		6. Pos.	X
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Neg.	Neg.		8. Neg.	Neg.
		9. X	X		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Neut.	Pos.		10. Pos.	Pos.
Part Three		1. Neut. ~~Ne~~	Neg.		1. Neg.	Pos.
		2. Neut.	Neut.		2. Pos.	Neg.
		3. Neut.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neg.	Pos.		4. Neut.	Neut.
		5. Neg.	Pos.		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. Neut.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Neut.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Neut.	Pos.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Neg.	Neg.		9. Pos.	Pos.
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	4	12	Pos.	13	13
	Neg.	7	5	Neg.	5	5
	Neut.	8	2	Neut.	2	2
	X	2	2	X	1	1

	E1	Pre-Test	Post-Test	F1	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Neut.	Neut.		1. Neg.	Pos.
Part Two		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Neg.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Pos.		5. Neg.	Neut.
		6. X	X		6. X	X
		7. Neg.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. X	Pos.		8. Neg.	Pos.
		9. Neg.	X		9. X	X
		10. Neut.	Neut.		10. Neut.	Neut.
Part Three		1. Neut.	Neut.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neut.	Neut.		2. Neg.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neut.	Neut.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Neut.	Pos.		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. Neut.ÞØ3.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Pos.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Pos.	Pos.		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Neut.	Neut.		10. Neg.	Neut.
	Pos.	7	13	Pos.	11	14
	Neg.	4	0	Neg.	7	2
	Neut.	8	6	Neut.	1	3
	X	2	2	X	2	2

	G1	Pre-Test	Post-Test	I1	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Neg.	Pos.		1. Neg.	Pos.
Part Two		1. Neut.	Pos.		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Neg.	Pos.
		3. Neut.	Neut.		3. Neg.	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Neut.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Neg.		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. Pos.	X		6. X	X
		7. X	X		7. Neg.	X
		8. X	X		8. Neg.	X
		9. Neg.	Pos.		9. X	Neg.
		10. Neut.	Pos.		10. Neg.	Pos.
Part Three		1. Neg.	Pos.		1. Neut.	Neut.
		2. Neg.	Neg.		2. Neut.	Pos.
		3. Neg.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. X	Pos.		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Neg.	Pos.		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. Pos.	Pos.		6. Neg.	Neg.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Neg.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Neut.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Pos.	Pos.		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Neg.	Pos.		10. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	7	14	Pos.	4	11
	Neg.	8	2	Neg.	12	5
	Neut.	3	2	Neut.	3	1
	X	3	3	X	2	4

	J1	Pre-Test	Post-Test	L1	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Neg.	Pos.		1. Neg.	Neut.
Part Two		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. X	X		3. X	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Pos.		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. X	X		6. X	X
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Neut.
		8. Neg.	Pos.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. X	X		9. X	X
		10. Neg.	Pos.		10. Neut.	Pos.
Part Three		1. Neg.	Pos.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Neut.		2. Neg.	Neg.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neut.	Neut.		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Neut.	Pos.		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. Pos.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Pos.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Neg.	Neg.		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Neg.	Pos.		10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	8	15	Pos.	9	9
	Neg.	8	1	Neg.	8	7
	Neut.	2	2	Neut.	1	2
	X	3	3	X	3	3

	N1	Pre-Test	Post-Test	01	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Neg.	Pos.
Part Two		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Neut.	Neut.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Neut.	Pos.
		3. Neg.	Pos.		3. X	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Neut.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Pos.		5. Neg.	Pos.
		6. X	X		6. X	X
		7. X	Pos.		7. Neg.	Pos.
		8. X	Pos.		8. X	Neg.
		9. Neut.	X		9. X	X
		10. Neg.	Pos.		10. Neg.	Pos.
Part Three		1. Neg.	Neut.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Pos.		2. Neut.	Neut.
		3. Neut.	Neut.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neut.	Neut,		4. Neut.	Neut.
		5. Neut.	Pos.		5. Neut.	Pos.
		6. Pos.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Pos.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Pos.	Neg.		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Pos.	Neut.		10. X	Pos.
	Pos.	9	14	Pos.	4	12
	Neg.	5	1	Neg.	6	3
	Neut.	4	4	Neut.	6	3
	X	3	2	X	5	3

	P1	Pre-Test	Post-Test	R1	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Neg.	Pos.		1. Neg.	Pos.
Part Two		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. X	X		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Pos.		5. Neut.	Pos.
		6. X	X		6. Neg.	X
		7. Neg.	Neut.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. X	X		8. Neg.	Pos.
		9. Neg.	Neg.		9. X	Neg.
		10. Neg.	Pos.		10. Neg.	Neg.
Part Three		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neut.	Neut.		2. Neg.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neut.	Neut.		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. X	Pos.		5. Neg.	Pos.
		6. Neg.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Neut.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Neg.	Neg.		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	6	10	Pos.	8	14
	Neg.	9	4	Neg.	11	6
	Neut.	2	4	Neut.	1	0
	X	4	3	X	1	1

	1a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Neg.	Neg.
Part Two		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. X	X
		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Neg.	Neg.
		9. X	X
		10. Neg.	Neg.
Part Three		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Neg.
		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neut.	Neut.
		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Neg.	Pos.
		9. Pos.	Pos.
		10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	10	11
	Neg.	8	7
	Neut.	1	1
	X	2	2

	3a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
		1. Neg.	Neg.
		1. X	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. X	X
		4. Pos.	X
		5. Neg.	X
		6. X	Neg.
		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Neg.	Neg.
		9. X	X
		10. Neut.	Neut.
		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Neg.
		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Neg.	Pos.
		6. Pos.	Neg.
		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Neut,	Pos.
		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	6	8
	Neg.	9	8
	Neut.	2	1
	X	4	4

	4a	Pre-Test	Post-Test	5a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
Part Two		1. Pos.	Neut.		1. Pos.	Neut.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Pos.	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Neg.		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. X	X		6. X	X
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Neg.
		8. Neg.	Neg.		8. Neg.	Neg.
		9. X	X		9. Neg.	X
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neg.	Neg.
Part Three		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Pos.		2. Neg.	Neg.
		3. Neg.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Neg.
		4. Neg.	Neg.		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Pos.	Pos.		5. Neg.	Pos.
		6. Pos.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Neg.		8. Neut.	Neg.
		9. Pos.	Pos.		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Pos.	Pos.		10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	11	11	Pos.	8	5
	Neg.	8	7	Neg.	11	12
	Neut.	0	1	Neut.	1	1
	X	2	2	X	1	3

6a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One	1. Neg.	Neg.
Part Two	1. Pos.	Pos.
	2. Pos.	Pos.
	3. Pos.	Pos.
	4. Pos.	Pos.
	5. Neg.	Neg.
	6. Neg.	X
	7. Pos.	Pos.
	8. Neg.	Neg.
	9. X	X
	10. Neg.	Neg.
Part Three	1. X	Neg.
	2. Neg.	Neg.
	3. Pos.	Pos.
	4. Neg.	Neg.
	5. Neg.	Neg.
	6. Pos.	Neg.
	7. Pos.	Pos.
	8. Pos.	Pos.
	9. Neg.	Neg.
	10. Neg.	X
Pos.	9	8
Neg.	10	10
Neut.	0	0
X	2	3

7a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
	1. Neg.	Neg.
	1. Neut.	Neut.
	2. Pos.	Pos.
	3. X	X
	4. Pos.	Pos.
	5. Neg.	Neg.
	6. X	X
	7. Pos.	X
	8. Neg.	X
	9. X	X
	10. Neg.	Neg.
	1. Neg.	Neg.
	2. Neut.	Neg.
	3. Pos.	Pos.
	4. Neut.	Neut.
	5. Neut.	Neut.
	6. Pos.	Pos.
	7. Pos.	Pos.
	8. Neg.	Neut.
	9. Neg.	Nge.
	10. Pos.	X
Pos.	7	5
Neg.	7	6
Neut.	4	4
X	3	6

	8a	Pre-Test	Post-Test	9a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
Part Two		1. Neut.	Neut.		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Pos.	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Nge.		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. X	X		6. X	X
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. X	X
		8. Neg.	Neg.		8. X	X
		9. X	X		9. Neg.	X
		10. Neg.	Nge.		10. Neg.	Neg.
Part Three		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. X	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Pos.		2. Neg.	Neg.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neg.	Nge.		4. Neg.	Neut.
		5. Pos.	Pos.		5. Pos.	Neut.
		6. Pos.	PVs.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Neut.
		8. Pos.	Pos.		8. Pos.	X
		9. Pos.	Pos.		9. Neut.	Pos.
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	9	11	Pos.	8	8
	Neg.	9	7	Neg.	7	5
	Neut.	1	1	Neut.	1	3
	X	2	2	X	5	5

	10a	Pre-Test	Post-Test	11a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Neg.	Ngg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
Part Two		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	X		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. X	X		3. X	X
		4. X	X		4. Pos.	Neut.
		5. X	X		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. Neg.	Neg.		6. X	X
		7. X	X		7. X	X
		8. X	X		8. X	X
		9. X	Neg.		9. X	Neg.
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neg.	Neg.
Part Three		1. Neg.	Nge.		1. X	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Neg.		2. Neut.	Neut.
		3. Pos.	Neut.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neut.	Neut.		4. Ngg.	Neg.
		5. Pos.	Pos.		5. Neut.	Neg.
		6. Typo error on post-test 6-9			6. X	Pos.
		7.			7. Pos.	Pos.
		8.			8. Pos.	Pos.
		9.			9. Neg.	X
		10. Neg.	Neut.		10. X	Pos.
	Pos.	4	2	Pos.	6	7
	Neg.	6	6	Neg.	5	7
	Neut.	1	3	Neut.	2	2
	X	6	6	X	8	5

	12a	Pre-Test	Post-Test	14a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
Part Two		1. Neut.	Neut.		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Neg.		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. X	X		6. X	X
		7. X	X		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. X	X		8. Neg.	Neg.
		9. Neg.	Neg.		9. X	X
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neg.	Neg.
Part Three		1. Neg.	Nge.		1. Nge.	Neut.
		2. Neg.	Neut.		2. Neut.	Neg.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neg.	Neg.		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Pos.	Pos.		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. Pos.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Pos.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Neg.	Neg.		9. Pos.	Pos.
		10. Neut.	Neut.		10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	8	8	Pos.	10	10
	Neg.	8	7	Neg.	8	8
	Neut.	2	3	Neut.	1	1
	X	3	3	X	2	2

	15a	Pre-Test	Post-Test	16a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
Part Two		1. Neut.	Neut.		1. Neut.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	X		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Neut.		3. X	X
		4. Pos.	X		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	X		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. X	X		6. X	X
		7. X	X		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. X	X		8. Neg.	Neg.
		9. X	X		9. X	X
		10. X	X		10. Neg.	Neg.
Part Three		1. X	X		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Neg.		2. Neg.	Neg.
		3. Neut.	Neut.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neg.	Neg.		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Pos.	Neg.		5. Pos.	Neut.
		6. Pos.	Neut.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Neg.	Neg.		8. Neut.	Neut.
		9. Neg.	Neg.		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	6	1	Pos.	7	7
	Neg.	7	7	Neg.	9	9
	Neut.	2	4	Neut.	2	2
	X	6	9	X	3	3

	18a	Pre-Test	Post-Test	19a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
Part Two		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	X		3. Pos.	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Neg.		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. X	X		6. X	X
		7. X	Pos.		7. Neut.	Neut.
		8. X	Neg.		8. X	X
		9. Neg.	X		9. Pos.	Pos.
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neg.	Pos.
Part Three		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neut.	Neg.		2. Pos.	Neg.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Neg.	Pos.
		4. Neg.	Neg.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Pos.	Pos.		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. Pos.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Neg.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Neg.	Pos.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Pos.	Pos.		9. Neut.	Neg.
		10. Pos.	Pos.		10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	10	11	Pos.	11	10
	Neg.	7	7	Neg.	6	7
	Neut.	1	0	Neut.	2	1
	X	3	3	X	2	3

20a	Pre-Test	Post-Test	21a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Part One	1. Neg.	Pos.		1. Neg.	Neg.
Part Two	1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Neg.	Neg.
	2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Neg.	Neg.
	3. X	X		3. Neut.	Neut.
	4. Pos.	Pos.		4. X	X
	5. Neg.	Neg.		5. X	X
	6. X	X		6. X	X
	7. Pos.	X		7. X	X
	8. Neg.	Neg.		8. X	X
	9. X	X		9. X	X
	10. Neut.	X		10. X	x
Part Three	1. Neg.	Pos.		1. Neg.	Neg.
	2. Neut.	Neg.		2. Neg.	Neg.
	3. Pos.	Neg.		3. Pos.	Pos.
	4. Neut.	Neut.		4. Neg.	Neut.
	5. Pos.	pos		5. Pos.	Pos.
	6. Pos.	Pos.		6. Neg.	Pos.
	7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
	8. Pos.	Pos.		8. Pos.	Pos.
	9. Neut.	Pos.		9. Neg.	Neg.
	10. Neg.	Pos.		10. X	Neg.
Pos.	9	11	Pos.	4	5
Neg.	5	4	Neg.	8	7
Neut.	4	1	Neut.	1	2
X	3	5	X	8	7

APPENDIX II

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO TEST IN SEPARATE AREAS

A1

		Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	X
	Pos.	5	3
	Neg.	0	0
	Neut.	0	0
	X	0	2
Terms		1. Neg.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Pos.	Pos.
		10. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	6	8
	Neg.	4	2
	Neut.	0	0
	X	0	0
Criteria		1. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. X	Neg.
		8. Pos.	X
		9. X	Pos.
		10. Pos.	Pos.
	Pos.	4	4
	Neg.	0	1
	Neut.	0	0
	X	2	1

	B1	Pre-Test	Post-Test	C1	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Neut.	Pos.		3. X	Pos.
		4. Pos.	Neut.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
	Pos.	4	4	Pos.	4	5
	Neg.	0	0	Neg.	0	0
	Neut.	1	1	Neut.	0	0
	X	0	0	X	1	0
Terms		1. Neut.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Pos.
		2. Neut.	Neut.		2. Pos.	Neg.
		3. Neut.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neg.	Pos.		4. Neut.	Neut.
		5. Neg.	Pos.		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. Neut.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Neut.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Neut.	Pos.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Neg.	Neg.		9. Pos.	Pos.
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	0	6	Pos.	7	7
	Neg.	4	3	Neg.	2	2
	Neut.	6	1	Neut.	1	1
	X	0	0	X	0	0
Criteria		1. Neg.	Pos.		1. Neut.	Neut.
		5. Neg.	Neg.		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. X	X		6. Pos.	X
		8. Neg.	Neg.		8. Neg.	Neg.
		9. X	X		9. Neg,	Neg.
		10. Neut.	Pos.		10. Pos.	Pos.
	Pos.	0	2	Pos.	2	1
	Neg.	3	2	Neg.	3	3
	Neut.	1	0	Neut.	1	1
	X	2	2	X	0	1

	E1	Pre-Test	Post-Test	F1	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Neg.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Neg.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
	Pos.	3	5	Pos.	5	5
	Neg.	2	0	Neg.	0	0
	Neut.	0	0	Neut.	0	0
	X	0	0	X	0	0
Terms		1. Neut.	Neut.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neut.	Neut.		2. Neg.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neut.	Neut.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Neut.	Pos.		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. Neut.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Pos.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Pos.	Pos.		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Neut.	Neut.		10. Neg.	Neut.
	Pos.	4	6	Pos.	6	7
	Neg.	0	0	Neg.	4	2
	Neut.	6	4	Neut.	0	1
	X	0	0	X	0	0
Criteria		1. Neut.	Neut.		1. Neg.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Pos.		5. Neg.	Neut.
		6. X	X		6. X	X
		8. X	Pos.		8. Neg.	Pos.
		9. Neg.	X		9. X	X
		10. Neut.	Neut.		10. Neut.	Neut.
	Pos.	0	2	Pos.	0	2
	Neg.	2	0	Neg.	3	0
	Neut.	2	2	Neut.	1	2
	X	2	2	X	2	2

	G1	Pre-Test	Post-Test	I1	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude		1. Neut.	Pos.		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Neg.	Pos.
		3. Neut.	Neut.		3. Neg.	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Neut.	Pos.
		7. X	X		7. Neg.	X
	Pos.	2	3	Pos.	1	3
	Neg.	0	0	Neg.	3	0
	Neut.	2	1	Neut.	1	0
	X	1	1	X	0	2
Terms		1. Neg.	Pos.		1. Neut.	Neut.
		2. Neg.	Neg.		2. Neut.	Pos.
		3. Neg.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. X	Pos.		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Neg.	Pos.		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. Pos.	Pos.		6. Neg.	Neg.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Neg.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Neut.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Pos.	Pos.		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Neg.	Pos.		10. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	4	8	Pos.	3	6
	Neg.	5	1	Neg.	5	3
	Neut.	0	1	Neut.	2	1
	X	1	0	X	0	0
Criteria		1. Neg.	Pos.		1. Neg.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Neg.		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. Pos.	X		6. X	X
		8. X	X		8. Neg.	X
		9. Neg.	Pos.		9. X	Neg.
		10. Neut.	Pos.		10. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	1	3	Pos.	0	2
	Neg.	3	1	Neg.	4	2
	Neut.	1	0	Neut.	0	0
	X	1	2	X	2	2

	J1	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude	1.	Pos.	Pos.
	2.	Pos.	Pos.
	3.	X	X
	4.	Pos.	Pos.
	7.	Pos.	Pos.
	Pos.	4	4
	Neg.	0	0
	Neut.	0	0
	X	1	1
Terms	1.	Neg.	Pos.
	2.	Neg.	Neut.
	3.	Pos.	Pos.
	4.	Neut.	Neut.
	5.	Neut.	Pos.
	6.	Pos.	Pos.
	7.	Pos.	Pos.
	8.	Pos.	Pos.
	9.	Neg.	Neg.
	10.	Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	4	7
	Neg.	4	1
	Neut.	2	2
	X	0	0
Criteria	1.	Neg.	Pos.
	5.	Neg.	Pos.
	6.	X	X
	8.	Neg.	Pos.
	9.	X	X
	10.	Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	0	4
	Neg.	4	0
	Neut.	0	0
	X	2	2

	L1	Pre-Test	Post-Test
	1.	Pos.	Pos.
	2.	Pos.	Pos.
	3.	X	X
	4.	Pos.	Pos.
	7.	Pos.	Neut.
	Pos.	4	3
	Neg.	0	0
	Neut.	0	1
	X	1	1
	1.	Neg.	Neg.
	2.	Neg.	Neg.
	3.	Pos.	Pos.
	4.	Neg.	Neg.
	5.	Pos.	Pos.
	6.	Pos.	Pos.
	7.	Pos.	Pos.
	8.	Pos.	Pos.
	9.	Neg.	Neg.
	10.	Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	5	5
	Neg.	5	5
	Neut.	0	0
	X	0	0
	1.	Neg.	Neut.
	5.	Neg.	Neg.
	6.	X	X
	8.	Neg.	Neg.
	9.	X	X
	10.	Neut.	Pos.
	Pos.	0	1
	Neg.	3	2
	Neut.	1	1
	X	2	2

	N1	Pre-Test	Post-Test	01	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Neut.	Neut.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Neut.	Pos.
		3. Neg.	Pos.		3. X	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Neut.	Pos.
		7. X	Pos.		7. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	3	5	Pos.	0	3
	Neg.	1	0	Neg.	1	0
	Neut.	0	0	Neut.	3	1
	X	1	0	X	1	1
Terms		1. Neg.	Neut.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Pos.		2. Neut.	Neut.
		3. Neut.	Neut.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neut.	Neut.		4. Neut.	Neut.
		5. Neut.	Pos.		5. Neut.	Pos.
		6. Pos.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Pos.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Pos.	Neg.		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Pos.	Neut.		10. X	Pos.
	Pos.	5	5	Pos.	4	6
	Neg.	2	1	Neg.	2	2
	Neut.	3	4	Neut.	3	2
	X	0	0	X	1	0
Criteria		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Neg.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Pos.		5. Neg.	Pos.
		6. X	X		6. X	X
		8. X	Pos.		8. X	Neg.
		9. Neut.	X		9. X	X
		10. Neg.	Pos.		10. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	1	4	Pos.	0	3
	Neg.	2	0	Neg.	3	1
	Neut.	1	0	Neut.	0	0
	X	2	2	X	3	2

	P1	Pre-Test	Post-Test	R1	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. X	X		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Neg.	Neut.		7. Pos.	Pos.
	Pos.	3	3	Pos.	4	4
	Neg.	1	0	Neg.	1	1
	Neut.	0	1	Neut.	0	0
	X	1	1	X	0	0
Terms		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neut.	Neut.	1	2. Neg.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neut.	Neut.		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. X	Pos.		5. Neg.	Pos.
		6. Neg.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Neut.		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Neg.	Neg.		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	3	4	Pos.	4	7
	Neg.	4	3	Neg.	6	3
	Neut.	2	3	Neut.	0	0
	X	1	0	X	0	0
Criteria		1. Neg.	Pos.		1. Neg.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Pos.		5. Neut.	Pos.
		6. X	X		6. Neg.	X
		8. X	X		8. Neg.	Pos.
		9. Neg.	Neg.		9. X	Neg.
		10. Neg.	Pos.		10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	0	3	Pos.	0	3
	Neg.	4	1	Neg.	4	2
	Neut.	0	0	Neut.	1	0
	X	2	2	X	1	1

	1a	Pre-Test	Post-Test	3a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. X	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. X	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Pos.	X
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
	Pos.	5	5	Pos.	3	3
	Neg.	0	0	Neg.	0	0
	Neut.	0	0	Neut.	0	0
	X	0	0	X	2	2
Terms		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Neg.		2. Neg.	Neg.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neut.	Neut.		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Pos.	Pos.		5. neg.	Pos.
		6. Pos.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Neg.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Neg.	Pos.		8. Neut.	Pos.
		9. Pos.	Pos.		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	5	6	Pos.	3	5
	Neg.	4	3	Neg.	6	5
	Neut.	1	1	Neut.	1	0
	X	0	0	X	0	0
Criteria		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Neg.	Neg.		5. Neg.	X
		6. X	X		6. X	Neg.
		8. Neg.	Neg.		8. Neg.	Neg.
		9. X	X		9. X	X
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neut.	Neut.
	Pos.	0	0	Pos.	0	0
	Neg.	4	4	Neg.	3	3
	Neut.	0	0	Neut.	1	1
	X	2	2	X	2	2

	4a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude		1. Pos.	Neut.
		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.
	Pos.	5	4
	Neg.	0	0
	Neut.	0	1
	X	0	0
Terms		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Pos.
		3. Neg.	Pos.
		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Neg.
		9. Pos.	Pos.
		10. Pos.	Pos.
	Pos.	6	7
	Neg.	4	3
	Neut.	0	0
	X	0	0
Criteria		1. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. X	X
		8. Neg.	Neg.
		9. X	X
		10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	0	0
	Neg.	4	4
	Neut.	0	0
	X	2	2

	5a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
		1. Pos.	Neut.
		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Neg.
	Pos.	5	2
	Neg.	0	1
	Neut.	0	1
	X	0	1
		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Neg.
		3. Pos.	Neg.
		4. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Neg.	Pos.
		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Neut.	Neg.
		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	3	3
	Neg.	6	7
	Neut.	1	0
	X	0	0
		1. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. X	x
		8. Neg.	Neg.
		9. Neg.	X
		10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	0	0
	Neg.	5	4
	Neut.	0	0
	X	1	2

	6a	Pre-Test	Post-Test	7a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude		1. Pos.	Pos.		1. Neut.	Neut.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. X	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	X
	Pos.	5	5	Pos.	3	2
	Neg.	0	0	Neg.	0	0
	Neut.	0	0	Neut.	1	1
	X	0	0	X	1	2
Terms		1. X	Neg.			
		2. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		2. Neut.	Neg.
		4. Neg.	Neg.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Neg.		4. Neut.	Neut.
		6. Pos.	Neg.		5. Neut.	Neut.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Neg.	Neg.		8. Neg.	Neut.
		10. Neg.	X		9. Neg.	Neg.
					10. Pos.	X
	Pos.	4	3	Pos.	4	3
	Neg.	5	6	Neg.	3	3
	Neut.	0	0	Neut.	3	3
	X	1	1	X	0	1
Criteria		1. Neg.	Neg.			
		5. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		6. Neg.	X		5. Neg.	Neg.
		8. Neg.	Neg.		6. X	X
		9. X	X		8. Neg.	X
		10. Neg.	Neg.		9. X	X
					10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	0	0	Pos.	0	0
	Neg.	5	4	Neg.	4	3
	Neut.	0	0	Neut.	0	0
	X	1	2	X	2	3

	8a	Pre-Test	Post-Test	9a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude		1. Neut.	Neut.		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Pos.	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.		4. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. X	X
	Pos.	4	4	Pos.	4	3
	Neg.	0	0	Neg.	0	0
	Neut.	1	1	Neut.	0	0
	X	0	0	X	1	2
Terms		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. X	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Pos.		2. Neg.	Neg.
		3. Pos.	Pos.		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neg.	Neg.		4. Neg.	Neut.
		5. Pos.	Pos.		5. Pos.	Neut.
		6. Pos.	Pos.		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.		7. Pos.	neut.
		8. Pos.	Pos.		8. X	Pos.
		9. Pos.	Pos.		9. Neut.	Pos.
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	6	7	Pos.	4	5
	Neg.	4	3	Neg.	3	2
	Neut.	0	0	Neut.	1	3
	X	0	0	X	2	0
Criteria		1. Neg.	Neg.		1. Neg.	Neg.
		5. Neg.	Neg.		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. X	X		6. X	X
		8. Neg.	Neg.		8. X	X
		9. X	X		9. Neg.	X
		10. Neg.	Neg.		10. Neg.	Neg.
	Pos.	0	0	Pos.	0	0
	Neg.	4	4	Neg.	4	3
	Neut.	0	0	Neut.	0	0
	X	2	2	X	2	3

10a

Attitude	Pre-Test	Post-Test
	1. Pos.	Pos.
	2. Pos.	X
	3. X	X
	4. X	X
	7. X	X
Pos.	2	1
Neg.	0	0
Neut.	0	0
X	3	4

Terms		
	1. Neg.	Neg.
	2. Neg.	Neg.
	3. Pos.	Neut.
	4. Neut.	Neut.
	5. Pos.	Pos.
	6. Typo error=	
	7.	
	8. 6-9	
	9.	
	10. Neg.	Neut.
Pos.	2	1
Neg.	3	2
Neut.	1	3
X	0	0

Criteria		
	1. Neg.	Neg.
	5. X	X
	6. Neg.	Neg.
	8. X	X
	9. X	Neg.
	10. Neg.	Neg.
Pos.	0	0
Neg.	3	4
Neut.	0	0
X	3	2

11a

	Pre-Test	Post-Test
	1. Pos.	Pos.
	2. Pos.	Pos.
	3. X	X
	4. Pos.	Neut.
	7. X	X
Pos.	3	2
Neg.	0	0
Neut.	0	1
X	2	2

	1. X	Neg.
	2. Neut.	Neut.
	3. Pos.	Pos.
	4. Neg.	Neg.
	5. Neut.	Neg.
	6. X	Pos.
	7. Pos.	Pos.
	8. Pos.	Pos.
	9. Neg.	X
	10. X	Pos.
Pos.	3	5
Neg.	2	3
Neut.	2	1
X	3	1

	1. Neg.	Neg.
	5. Neg.	Neg.
	6. X	X
	8. X	X
	9. X	Neg.
	10. Neg.	Neg.
Pos.	0	0
Neg.	3	4
Neut.	0	0
X	3	2

12a

Attitude

	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1.	Neut.	Neut.
2.	Pos.	Pos.
3.	Pos.	Pos.
4.	Pos.	Pos.
7.	X	X
Pos.	3	3
Neg.	0	0
Neut.	1	1
X	1	1

Terms

1.	Neg.	Neg.
2.	Neg.	Neut.
3.	Pos.	Pos.
4.	Neg.	Neg.
5.	Pos.	Pos.
6.	Pos.	Pos.
7.	Pos.	Pos.
8.	Pos.	Pos.
9.	Neg.	Neg.
10.	Neut.	Neut.
Pos.	5	5
Neg.	4	3
Neut.	1	2
X	0	0

Criteria

1.	Neg.	Neg.
5.	Neg.	Neg.
6.	X	X
8.	X	X
9.	Neg.	Neg.
10.	Neg.	Neg.
Pos.	0	0
Neg.	4	4
Neut.	0	0
X	2	2

14a

	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1.	Pos.	Pos.
2.	Pos.	Pos.
3.	Pos.	Pos.
4.	Pos.	Pos.
7.	Pos.	Pos.
Pos.	5	5
Neg.	0	0
Neut.	0	0
X	0	0

1.	Neg.	Neut.
2.	Neut.	Neg.
3.	Pos.	Pos.
4.	Neg.	Neg.
5.	Neg.	Neg.
6.	Pos.	Pos.
7.	Pos.	Pos.
8.	Pos.	Pos.
9.	Pos.	Pos.
10.	Neg.	Neg.
Pos.	5	5
Neg.	4	4
Neut.	1	1
X	0	0

1.	Neg.	Nge.
5.	Neg.	Neg.
6.	X	X
8.	Neg.	Neg.
9.	X	X
10.	Neg.	Neg.
Pos.	0	0
Neg.	4	4
Neut.	0	0
X	2	2

15a

	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude		
1.	Neut.	Neut.
2.	Pos.	X
3.	Pos.	Neut.
4.	Pos.	X
7.	X	X
Pos.	3	0
Neg.	0	0
Neut.	1	2
X	1	3
Terms		
1.	X	X
2.	Neg.	Neg.
3.	Neut.	Neut.
4.	Neg.	Neg.
5.	Pos.	Neg.
6.	Pos.	Neut.
7.	Pos.	Pos.
8.	Neg.	Neg.
9.	Neg.	Neg.
10.	Neg.	Neg.
Pos.	3	1
Neg.	5	6
Neut.	1	2
X	1	1
Criteria		
1.	Neg.	Neg.
5.	Neg.	X
6.	X	X
8.	X	X
9.	X	X
10.	X	X
Pos.	0	0
Neg.	2	1
Neut.	0	0
X	4	5

16a

	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1.	Neut.	Pos.
2.	Pos.	Pos.
3.	X	X
4.	Pos.	Pos.
7.	Pos.	Pos.
Pos.	3	4
Neg.	0	0
Neut.	1	0
X	1	1
1.	Neg.	Neg.
2.	Neg.	Neg.
3.	Pos.	Pos.
4.	Neg.	Neg.
5.	Pos.	Neut.
6.	Pos.	Pos.
7.	Pos.	Pos.
8.	Neut.	Neut.
9.	Neg.	Neg.
10.	Neg.	Neg.
Pos.	4	3
Neg.	5	5
Neut.	1	2
X	0	0
1.	Neg.	Neg.
5.	Neg.	Neg.
6.	X	X
8.	Neg.	Neg.
9.	X	X
10.	Neg.	Neg.
Pos.	0	0
Neg.	4	4
Neut.	0	0
X	2	2

18a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude		
	1. Pos.	Pos.
	2. Pos.	Pos.
	3. Pos.	X
	4. Pos.	Pos.
	7. X	X
Pos.	4	3
Neg.	0	0
Neut.	0	0
X	1	2
Terms		
	1. Neg.	Neg.
	2. Neut.	Neg.
	3. Pos.	Pos.
	4. Neg.	Neg.
	5. Pos.	Pos.
	6. Pos.	Pos.
	7. Pos.	Pos.
	8. Neg.	Pos.
	9. Pos.	Pos.
	10. Pos.	Pos.
Pos.	6	7
Neg.	3	3
Neut.	1	0
X	0	0
Criteria		
	1. Neg.	Neg.
	5. Neg.	Neg.
	6. X	X
	8. X	Neg.
	9. Neg.	X
	10. Neg.	Neg.
Pos.	0	0
Neg.	4	4
Neut.	0	0
X	2	2

19a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
	1. Pos.	Pos.
	2. Pos.	Pos.
	3. Pos.	X
	4. Pos.	pos.
	7. Neut.	Neut.
Pos.	4	3
Neg.	0	0
Neut.	1	1
X	0	1
	1. Neg.	Neg.
	2. Pos.	Neg.
	3. Neg.	Pos.
	4. Pos.	Pos.
	5. Pos.	Pos.
	6. Pos.	Neg.
	7. Pos.	Pos.
	8. Pos.	Pos.
	9. Neut.	Neg.
	10. Neg.	Neg.
Pos.	6	5
Neg.	3	5
Neut.	1	0
X	0	0
	1. Neg.	Neg.
	5. Neg.	Neg.
	6. X	X
	8. X	X
	9. Pos.	Pos.
	10. Neg.	Pos.
Pos.	1	2
Neg.	3	2
Neut.	0	0
X	2	2

	20a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
Attitude		1. Pos.	Pos.
		2. Pos.	Pos.
		3. X	X
		4. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	X
	Pos.	4	3
	Neg.	0	0
	Neut.	0	0
	X	1	2
Terms		1. Neg.	Pos.
		2. Neut.	Neg.
		3. Pos.	Neg.
		4. Neut.	Neut.
		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. Pos.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Neut.	Pos.
		10. Neg.	Pos.
	Pos.	5	7
	Neg.	2	2
	Neut.	3	1
	X	0	0
Criteria		1. Neg.	Pos.
		5. Neg.	Neg.
		6. X	X
		8. Neg.	Neg.
		9. X	X
		10. Neut.	X
	Pos.	0	1
	Neg.	3	2
	Neut.	1	0
	X	2	3

	21a	Pre-Test	Post-Test
		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Neg.
		3. Neut.	Neut.
		4. X	X
		7. X	X
	Pos.	0	0
	Neg.	2	2
	Neut.	1	1
	X	2	2
		1. Neg.	Neg.
		2. Neg.	Neg.
		3. Pos.	Pos.
		4. Neg.	Neut.
		5. Pos.	Pos.
		6. Neg.	Pos.
		7. Pos.	Pos.
		8. Pos.	Pos.
		9. Neg.	Neg.
		10. X	Neg.
	Pos.	4	5
	Neg.	5	4
	Neut.	0	1
	X	1	0
		1. Neg.	Neg.
		5. X	X
		6. X	X
		8. X	X
		9. X	X
		10. X	X
	Pos.	0	0
	Neg.	1	1
	Neut.	0	0
	X	5	5

APPENDIX III

TEXTS OF CHILDREN'S STORIES USED IN THE STUDY

ZLATEH THE GOAT

by

Isaac Bashevis Singer

At Hanukkah time the road from the village to the town is usually covered with snow, but this year the winter had been a mild one. Hanukkah had almost come, yet little snow had fallen. The sun shone most of the time. The peasants complained that because of the dry weather there would be a poor harvest of winter grain. New grass sprouted, and the peasants sent their cattle out to pasture.

For Reuven the furrier it was a bad year, and after long hesitation he decided to sell Zlateh the goat. She was old and gave little milk. Feyvel the town butcher had offered eight gulden for her. Such a sum would buy Hanukkah candles, potatoes and oil for pancakes, gifts for the children, and other holiday necessaries for the house. Reuven told his oldest boy Aaron to take the goat to town.

Aaron understood what taking the goat to Feyvel meant, but he had to obey his father. Leah, his mother, wiped the tears from her eyes when she heard the news. Aaron's younger sisters, Anna and Miriam, cried loudly. Aaron put on his quilted jacket and a cap with earmuffs, bound a rope around Zlateh's neck, and took along two slices of bread with cheese to eat on the road. Aaron was supposed to deliver the goat by evening, spend the night at the butcher's, and return the next day with the money.

While the family said good-bye to the goat, and Aaron placed the rope around her neck, Zlateh stood as patiently and good-naturedly as ever. She licked Reuven's hand. She shook her small white beard. Zlateh trusted human beings. She knew that they always fed her and never did her any harm.

When Aaron brought her out on the road to town, she seemed somewhat astonished. She'd never been led in that direction before. She looked back at him questioningly, as if to say, "Where are you taking me?" But after a while she seemed to come to the conclusion that a goat shouldn't ask questions. Still, the road was different. They passed new fields, pastures, and huts with thatched roofs. Here and there a dog barked and came running after them, but Aaron chased it away with his stick.

The sun was shining when Aaron left the village. Suddenly the weather changed. A large black cloud with a bluish center appeared in the east and spread itself rapidly over the sky. A cold wind blew in with it. The crows flew low, croaking. At first it looked as if it would rain, but instead it began to hail as in summer. It was early in the day, but it became dark as dusk. After a while the hail turned to snow.

In his twelve years Aaron had seen all kinds of weather, but he had never experienced a snow like this one. It was so dense it shut out the light of the day. In a short time their path was completely covered. The wind became as cold as ice. The road to town was narrow and winding. Aaron no longer knew where he was. He could not see through the snow. The cold soon penetrated his quilted jacket.

At first Zlateh didn't seem to mind the change in weather. She too was twelve years old and knew what winter meant. But when her legs sank deeper and deeper into the snow, she began to turn her head and look at Aaron in wonderment. Her mild eyes seemed to ask, "Why are we out in such a storm?" Aaron hoped that a peasant would come along with his cart, but no one passed by.

The snow grew thicker, falling to the ground in large, whirling flakes. Beneath it Aaron's boots touched the softness of a plowed road. He had gone astray.

He could no longer figure out which was east or west, which way was the village, the town. The wind whistled, howled, whirled the snow about in eddies. It looked as if white imps were playing tag on the fields. A white dust rose above the ground. Zlateh stopped. She could walk no longer. Stubbornly she anchored her cleft hooves in the earth and bleated as if pleading to be taken home. Icicles hung from her white beard, and her horns were glazed with frost.

Aaron did not want to admit the danger, but he knew just the same that if they did not find shelter they would freeze to death. This was no ordinary storm. It was a mighty blizzard. The snowfall had reached his knees. His hands were numb, and he could no longer feel his toes. He choked when he breathed. His nose felt like wood, and he rubbed it with snow. Zlateh's bleating began to sound like crying. Those humans in whom she had so much confidence had dragged her into a trap. Aaron began to pray to God for himself and for the innocent animal.

Suddenly he made out the shape of a hill. He wondered what it could be. Who had piled snow into such a huge heap? He moved toward it, dragging Zlateh after him. When he came hear it, he realized that it was a large haystack which the snow had blanketed.

Aaron realized immediately that they were saved. With great effort he dug his way through the snow. He was a village boy and knew what to do. When he reached the hay, he hollowed out a nest for himself and the goat. No matter how cold it may be outside, in the hay it is always warm. And hay was food for Zlateh. The moment she smelled it she became contented and began to eat. Outside the snow continued to fall. It quickly covered the passageway Aaron had dug. But a boy and an animal need to breathe, and there was hardly any air in their hideout. Aaron bored a kind of window through the hay and snow and carefully kept the passage clear.

Zlateh, having eaten her fill, sat down on her hind legs and seemed to have regained her confidence in man. Aaron ate his two slices of bread and cheese, but after the difficult journey he was still hungry. He looked at Zlateh and noticed her udders were full. He lay down next to her, placing himself so that when he milked her he could squirt the milk into his mouth. It was rich and sweet. Zlateh was not accustomed to being milked that way, but she did not resist. On the contrary, she seemed eager to reward Aaron for bringing her to a shelter whose very walls, floor, and ceiling were made of food.

Through the window Aaron could catch a glimpse of the chaos outside. The wind carried before it whole drifts of snow. It was completely dark, and he did not know whether night had already come or whether it was the darkness of the storm. Thank God that in the hay it was not cold. The dried hay, grass, and field flowers exuded the warmth of the summer sun. Zlateh ate frequently; she nibbled from above, below, from the left and right. Her body gave forth an animal warmth, and Aaron cuddled up to her. He had always loved Zlateh, but now she was like a sister. He was along, cut off from his family, and wanted to talk. He began to talk to Zlateh. "Zlateh, what do you think about what has happened to us?" he asked.

"Maaaa," Zlateh answered.

"If we hadn't found this stack of hay, we would both be frozen stiff by now," Aaron said.

"Maaaa," was the goat's reply.

"If the snow keeps on falling like this, we may have to stay here for days," Aaron explained.

"Maaaa," Zlateh bleated.

"What does 'Maaaa' mean?" Aaron asked. "You'd better speak up clearly."

"Maaaa. Maaaa," Zlateh tried.

"Well, let it be 'Maaaa' then," Aaron said patiently. "You can't speak, but I know you understand. I need you and you need me. Isn't that right?"

"Maaaa."

Aaron became sleepy. He made a pillow out of some hay, leaned his head on it, and dozed off. Zlateh too fell asleep.

When Aaron opened his eyes, he didn't know whether it was morning or night. The snow had blocked up his window. He tried to clear it, but when he had bored through to the length of his arm, he still hadn't reached the outside. Luckily he had his stick with him and was able to break through to the open air. It was still dark outside. The snow continued to fall and the wind wailed, first with one voice and then with many. Sometimes it had the sound of devilish laughter. Zlateh too awoke, and when Aaron greeted her, she answered, "Maaaa," Yes, meant Zlateh's language consisted of only one word, but it meant many things. Now she was saying, "We must accept all that God gives us--heat, cold, hunger, satisfaction, light, and darkness."

Aaron had awakened hungry. He had eaten up his food, but Zlateh had plenty of milk.

For three days Aaron and Zlateh stayed in the haystack. Aaron had always loved Zlateh, but in these three days he loved her more and more. She fed him with her milk and helped him keep warm. She comforted him with her patience. He told her many stories, and she always cocked her ears and listened. When he patted her, she licked his hand and his face. Then she said, "Maaaa," and he knew it meant, I love you too.

The snow fell for three days, though after the first day it was not as thick and the wind quieted down. Sometimes Aaron felt that there could never have been a summer, that the snow had always fallen, ever since he could remember. He, Aaron, never had a father or mother or sisters. He was a snow child, born of the snow, and so was Zlateh. It was so quiet in the hay that his ears rang in the stillness. Aaron and Zlateh slept all night and a good part of the day. As for Aaron's dreams, they were all about warm weather. He dreamed of green fields, trees covered with blossoms, clear brooks, and singing birds. By the third night, the snow had stopped, but Aaron did not dare to find his way home in the darkness. The sky became clear and the moon shone, casting silvery nets on the snow. Aaron dug his way out and looked at the world. It was all white, quiet, dreaming dreams of heavenly splendor. The stars were large and close. The moon swam in the sky as in a sea.

On the morning of the fourth day Aaron heard the ringing of sleigh bells. The haystack was not far from the road. The peasant who drove the sleigh pointed out the way to him--not to the town and Feyvel the butcher, but home to the village. Aaron had decided in the haystack that he would never part with Zlateh.

Aaron's family and their neighbors had searched for the boy and the goat but had found no trace of them during the storm. They feared they were lost. Aaron's mother and sisters cried for him; his father remained silent and gloomy. Suddenly one of the neighbors came running to their house with the news that Aaron and Zlateh were coming up the road.

There was great joy in the family. Aaron told them how he had found the stack of hay and how Zlateh had fed him with her milk. Aaron's sisters kissed and hugged Zlateh and gave her a special treat of chopped carrots and potato peels,

which Zlateh gobbled up hungrily.

Nobody ever again thought of selling Zlateh, and now that the cold weather had finally set in, the villagers needed the services of Reuven the furrier once more. When Hanukkah came, Aaron's mother was able to fry pancakes every evening, and Zlateh got her portion too. Even though Zlateh had her own pen, she often came to the kitchen, knocking on the door with her horns to indicate that she was ready to visit, and she was always admitted. In the evening Aaron, Miriam, and Anna played dreidel. Zlateh sat near the stove watching the children and the flickering of the Hanukkas candles.

Once in a while Aaron would ask her, "Zlateh, do you remember the three days we spent together?"

And Zlateh would scratch her neck with a horn, shake her white bearded hear and come out with a single sound which expressed all her thoughts, and all her love.

FREDERICK

by

Leo Lionni

All along the meadow where the cows grazed and the horses ran, there was an old stone wall. In that wall, not far from the barn and the granary, a chatty family of field mice had their home. But the farmers had moved away, the barn was abandoned, and the granary stood empty. And since winter was not far off, the little mice began to gather corn and nuts and wheat and straw. They all worked day and night. All--except Frederick.

"Frederick, why don't you work?" they asked.

"I do work," said Frederick. "I gather sun rays for the cold dark winter days."

And when they saw Frederick sitting there, staring at the meadow, they said, "And now, Frederick?"

"I gather colors," answered Frederick simply. "For winter is gray."

And once Frederick seemed half asleep. "Are you dreaming, Frederick?" they asked reproachfully. But Frederick said, "Oh no, I am gathering words. For the winter days are long and many, and we'll run out of things to say."

The winter days came, and when the first snow fell the five little field mice took to their hideout in the stones. In the beginning there was lots to eat, and the mice told stories of foolish foxes and silly cats. They were a happy family.

But little by little they had nibbled up most of the nuts and berries, the straw was gone, and the corn was only a memory. It was cold in the wall and no one felt like chatting.

Then they remembered what Frederick had said about sun rays and colors and words. "What about your supplies, Frederick?" they asked.

"Close your eyes," said Frederick, as he climbed on a big stone. "Now I send you the rays of the sun. Do you feel how their golden glow..." And as Frederick spoke of the sun the four little mice began to feel warmer. Was it Frederick's voice? Was it magic?

"And how about the colors, Frederick?" they asked anxiously.

"Close your eyes again," Frederick said. And when he told them of the blue periwinkles, the red poppies in the yellow wheat, and the green leaves of the berry bush, they saw the colors as clearly as if they had been painted in their minds.

"And the words, Frederick?

Frederick cleared his throat, waited a moment, and then, as if from a stage, he said:

"Who scatters snowflakes? Who melts the ice?
Who spoils the weather? Who makes it nice?
Who grows the four-leaf clovers in June?
Who dims the daylight? Who lights the moon?

Four little field mice who live in the sky.
Four little field mice...like you and I.

One is the Springmouse who turns on the showers.
Then comes the Summer who paints in the flowers.
The Fallmouse is next with walnuts and wheat.
And Winter is last...with little cold feet.

Aren't we lucky the seasons are four?
Think of a year with one less...or one more!"

When Frederick had finished, they all applauded. "But Frederick," they said, "you are a poet!"

Frederick blushed, took a bow, and said shyly, "I know it."

THE BAT-POET

by

Randall Jarrell

Once upon a time there was a bat--a little light brown bat, the color of coffee with cream in it. He looked like a furry mouse with wings. When I'd go in and out of my front door, in the daytime, I'd look up over my head and see him hanging upside down from the roof of the porch. He and the others hung there in a bunch, all snuggled together with their wings folded, fast asleep. Sometimes one of them would wake up for a minute and get in a more comfortable position, and then the others would wriggle around in their sleep till they'd got more comfortable too; when they all moved it looked as if a fur wave went over them. At night they'd fly up and down, around and around, and catch insects and eat them; on a rainy night, though, they'd stay snuggled together just as though it were still day. If you pointed a flashlight at them you'd see them screw up their faces to keep the light out of their eyes.

Toward the end of summer all the bats except the little brown one began sleeping in the barn. He missed them, and tried to get them to come back and sleep on the porch with him. "What do you want to sleep in the barn for?" he asked them.

"We don't know," the others said. "What do you want to sleep on the porch for?"

"It's where we always sleep," he said. "If I slept in the barn I'd be homesick. Do come back and sleep with me!" But they wouldn't.

So he had to sleep all alone. He missed the others. They had always felt so warm and furry against him; whenever he'd waked, he'd pushed himself up into

the middle of them and gone right back to sleep. Now he'd wake up and, instead of snuggling against the others and going back to sleep, he would just hang there and think. Sometimes he would open his eyes and little and look out into the sunlight. It gave him a queer feeling for it to be daytime and for him to be hanging there looking; he felt the way you would feel if you woke up and went to the window and stayed there for hours, looking out into the moonlight.

It was different in the daytime. The squirrels and the chipmunk, that he had never seen before--at night they were curled up in their nests or holes, fast asleep--ate nuts and acorns and seeds, and ran after each other, playing. And all the birds hopped and sang and flew; at night they had been asleep, except for the mockingbird. The bat had always heard the mockingbird. The mockingbird would sit on the highest branch of a tree, in the moonlight, and sing half the night. The bat loved to listen to him. He could imitate all the other birds--he'd even imitate the way the squirrels chattered when they were angry, like to rocks being knocked together; and he could imitate the milk bottles being put down on the porch and the barn door closing, a long rusty squeak. And he made up songs and words all his own, that nobody else had ever said or sung.

The bat told the other bats about all the things you could see and hear in the daytime. "You'd love them," he said. "The next time you wake up in the daytime, just keep your eyes open for a while and don't go back to sleep."

The other bats were sure they wouldn't like that. "We wish we didn't wake up at all," they said. "When you wake up in the daytime the light hurts your eyes--the thing to do is to close them and go right back to sleep. Day's to sleep in; as soon as it's night we'll open our eyes."

"But won't you even try it?" the little brown bat said. "Just for once, try it."

The bats all said: "No."

"But why not?" asked the little brown bat.

The bats said: "We don't know. We just don't want to."

"At least listen to the mockingbird. When you hear him it's just like the daytime."

The other bats said: "He sounds so queer. If only he squeaked or twittered--but he keeps shouting in that bass voice of his." They said his because the mockingbird's voice sounded terribly loud and deep to them; they always made little high twittering sounds themselves.

"Once you get used to it you'll like it," the little bat said. "Once you get used to it, it sounds wonderful."

"All right," said the others, "we'll try." But they were just being polite; they didn't try.

The little brown bat kept waking up in the daytime, and kept listening to the mockingbird, until one day he thought: "I could make up a song like the mockingbird's." But when he tried, his high notes were all high and his low notes were all high and the notes in between here all high: he couldn't make a tune. So he imitated the mockingbird's words instead. At first his words didn't go together--even the bat could see that they didn't sound a bit like the mockingbird's. But after a while some of them began to sound beautiful, so that the bat said to himself: "If you get the words right you don't need a tune."

The bat went over and over his words till he could say them off by heart.

That night he said them to the other bats. "I've made the words like the mockingbird's," he told them, "so you can tell what it's like in the daytime." Then he said to them in a deep voice--he couldn't help imitating the mockingbird--his words about the daytime:

> At dawn, the sun shines like a million moons
> And all the shadows are as bright as moonlight.
> The birds begin to sing with all their might.
> The world awakens and forgets the night.
>
> The black-and-gray turns green-and-gold-and-blue.
> The squirrels begin to--

But when he'd got this far the other bats just couldn't keep quiet any longer.

"The sun hurts," said one. "It hurts like getting something in your eyes."

"That's right," said another. "And shadows are black--how can a shadow be bright?"

Another one said: "What's green-and-gold-and-blue? When you say things like that we don't know what you mean."

"And it's just not real," the first one said. "When the sun rises the world goes to sleep."

"But go on," said one of the others. "We didn't mean to interrupt you."

"No, we're sorry we interrupted you," all the others said. "Say us the rest."

But when the bat tried to say them the rest he couldn't remember a word. It was hard to say anything at all, but finally he said: "I--I--tomorrow I'll say you the rest." Then he flew back to the porch. There were lots of insects around the light, but he didn't catch a one; instead he flew to his rafter, hung there upside down with his wings folded, and after a while went to sleep.

But he kept on making poems like the mockingbird's--only now he didn't say

them to the bats. One night he saw a mother possum, with all her little white baby possums holding tight to her, eating the fallen apples under the apple tree; one night an owl swooped down on him and came so close he'd have caught him if the bat hadn't flown into a hole in the old oak by the side of the house; and another time four squirrels spent the whole morning chasing each other up and down trees, across the lawn, and over the roof. He made up poems about them all. Sometimes the poem would make him think: "It's like the mockingbird. This time it's really like the mockingbird!" But sometimes the poem would seem so bad to him that he'd get discouraged and stop in the middle, and by the next day he'd have forgotten it.

When he would wake up in the daytime and hang there looking out at the colors of the world, he would say the poems over to himself. He wanted to say them to the other bats, but then he would remember what had happened when he'd said them before. There was nobody for him to say the poems to.

One day he thought: "I could say them to the mockingbird." It got to be a regular thought of his. It was a long time, though, before he really went to the mockingbird.

The mockingbird had bad days when he would try to drive everything out of the yard, no matter what it was. He always had a peremptory, authoritative look, as if he were more alive than anything else and wanted everything else to know it; on his bad days he'd dive on everything that came into the year--on cats and dogs, even--and strike at them with his little sharp claws. On his good days he didn't pay so much attention to the world, but just sang.

The day the bat went to him the mockingbird was perched on the highest branch

of the big willow by the porch, singing with all his might. He was a clear gray, with white bars across his wings that flashed when he flew; every part of him had a clear, quick, decided look about it. He was standing on tiptoe, singing and singing and singing; sometimes he'd spring up into the air. This time he was singing a song about mockingbirds.

The bat fluttered to the nearest branch, hung upside down from it, and listened; finally when the mockingbird stopped for a moment he said in his little high voice: "It's beautiful, just beautiful!"

"You like poetry?" asked the mockingbird. You could tell from the way he said it that he was surprised.

"I love it," said the bat. "I listen to you every night. Every day too. I--I--"

"It's the last poem I've composed, " said the mockingbird. "It!s called 'To a Mockingbird.'"

"It's wonderful," the bat said. "Wonderful!" Of all the songs I ever heard you sing, it's the best."

This pleased the mockingbird--mockingbirds love to be told that their last song is the best. "I'll sing it for you again," the mockingbird offered.

"Oh, please do sing it again," said the bat. "I'd love to hear it again. Just love to! Only when you've finished could I--"

But the mockingbird had already started. He not only sang it again, but he made up new parts, and sang them over and over and over; they were so beautiful that the bat forgot about his own poem and just listened. When the mockingbird had finished, the bat thought: "No, I just can't say him mine. Still,

though--" He said to the mockingbird: "It's wonderful to get to hear you. I could listen to you forever."

"It's a pleasure to sing to such a responsive audience," said the mockingbird. "Any time you'd like to hear it again just tell me."

The bat said: "Could--could--"

"Yes?" said the mockingbird.

The bat went on in a shy voice: "Do you suppose that I--that I could--"

The mockingbird said warmly: "That you could hear it again? Of course you can. I'll be delighted." And he sang it all over again. This time it was the best of all.

The bat told him so, and the mockingbird looked pleased but modest; it was easy for him to look pleased but hard for him to look modest, he was so full of himself. The bat asked him: "Do you suppose a bat could make poems like yours?"

"A bat?" the mockingbird said. But them he went on politely, "Well, I don't see why not. He couldn't sing them, of course--he simply doesn't have the range; but that's no reason he couldn't make them up. Why, I suppose for bats a bat's poems would be ideal."

The bat said: "Sometimes when I wake up in the daytime I make up poems. Could I--I wonder whether I could say you one of my poems?"

A queer look came over the mockingbird's face, but he said cordially: "I'd be delighted to hear one. Go right ahead." He settled himself on his branch with a listening expression.

The bat said:

A shadow is floating through the moonlight.
Its wings don't make a sound.
Its claws are long, its beak is bright.
Its eyes try all the corners of the night.

It calls and calls: all the air swells and heaves
And washes up and down like water.
The ear that listens to the owl believes
In death. The bat beneath the eaves,

The mouse beside the stone are still as death--
The owl's air washes them like water.
The owl goes back and forth inside the night,
And the night holds its breath.

When he'd finished his poem the bat waited for the mockingbird to say something; he didn't know it, but he was holding his breath.

"Why, I like it," said the mockingbird. "Technically it's quite accomplished. The way you change the rhyme-scheme's particularly effective."

The bat said: "It is?"

"Oh yes," said the mockingbird. "And it was clever of you to have that last line two feet short."

The bat said blankly: "Two feet short?"

"It's two feet short," said the mockingbird a little impatiently. "The next-to-the-last line's iambic pentameter, and the last line's iambic trimeter."

The bat looked so bewildered that the mockingbird said in a kind voice: "An iambic foot has one weak syllable and one strong syllable; the weak one comes first. That last line of yours has six syllables and the one before it has ten: when you shorten the last line like that it gets the effect of the night holding its breath."

"I didn't know that," the bat said. "I just made it like holding your breath."

"To be sure, to be sure!" said the mockingbird. "I enjoyed your poem very much. When you've made up some more do come round and say me another."

The bat said that he would, and fluttered home to his rafter. Partly he felt very good--the mockingbird had liked his poem--and partly he felt just terrible. He thought: "Why, I might as well have said it to the bats. What do I care how many feet it has? The owl nearly kills me, and he says he likes the rhyme-scheme!" He hung there upside down, thinking bitterly. After a while he said to himself: "The trouble isn't making poems, the trouble's finding somebody that will listen to them."

Before he went to sleep he said his owl-poem over to himself, and it seemed to him that it was exactly like the owl. "The owl would like it," he thought. "If only I could say it to the owl!"

And then he thought: "That's it! I can't say it to the owl, I don't dare get that near him; but if I made up a poem about the chipmunk I could say it to the chipmunk--he'd be interested." The bat got so excited his fur stood up straight and he felt warm all over. He thought: "I'll go to the chipmunk and say, 'If you'll give me six crickets I'll make a poem about you.' Really I'd do it for nothing; but they don't respect something if they get it for nothing. I'll say: 'For six crickets I'll do your portrait in verse.'"

The next day, at twilight, the bat flew to the chipmunk's hole. The chipmunk had dozens of holes, but the bat had noticed that there was one he liked best and always slept in. Before long the chipmunk ran up, his cheeks bulging. "Hello," said the bat.

The instant he heard the bat the chipmunk froze; then he dived into his hole. "Wait! Wait!" the bat cried. But the chipmunk had disappeared. "Come back," the bat called. "I won't hurt you." But he had to talk for a long time

before the chipmunk came back, and even then he just stuck the tip of his nose out of the hole.

The bat hardly knew how to begin, but he timidly said to the chipmunk, who listened timidly: "I thought of making this offer to--to the animals of the vicinity. You're the first one I've made it to."

The chipmunk didn't say anything. The bat gulped, and said quickly: "For only six crickets I'll do your portrait in verse."

The chipmunk said: "What are crickets?"

The bat felt discouraged. "I knew I might have to tell him about poems," he thought, "but I never thought I'd have to tell him about crickets." He explained: "They're little black things you see on the porch at night, by the light. They're awfully good. But that's all right about them; instead of crickets you could give me--well, this time you don't have to give my anything. It's a--an introductory offer."

The chipmunk said in a friendly voice: "I don't understand."

"I'll make you a poem about yourself," said the bat. "One just about you." He saw from the look in the chipmunk's eyes that the chipmunk didn't understand. The bat said: "I'll say you a poem about the owl, and then you'll see what it's like."

He said his poem and the chipmunk listened intently; when the poem was over the chipmunk gave a big shiver and said, "It's terrible, just terrible! Is there really something like that at night?"

The bat said: "If it weren't for that hole in the oak he'd have got me."

The chipmunk said in a determined voice: "I'm going to bed earlier. Some-

times when there're lots of nuts I stay out till it's pretty dark; but believe me, I'm never going to again."

The bat said: "It's a pleasure to say a poem to--to such a responsive audience. Do you want me to start on the poem about you?"

The chipmunk said thoughtfully: "I don't have enough holes. It'd be awfully easy to dig some more holes."

"Shall I start on the poem about you?" asked the bat.

"All right," said the chipmunk. "But could you put in lots of holes? The first thing in the morning I'm going to dig myself another."

"I'll put in a lot," the bat promised. "Is there anything else you'd like to have in it?"

The chipmunk thought for a minute and said, "Well, nuts. And seeds--those big fat seeds they have in the feeder."

"All right," said the bat. "Tomorrow afternoon I'll be back. Or day after tomorrow--I don't really know how long it will take." He and the chipmunk said good-by to each other and he fluttered home to the porch. As soon as he got comfortably settled he started to work on the poem about the chipmunk. But somehow he kept coming back to the poem about the owl, and what the chipmunk had said, and how he'd looked. "He didn't say any of that two-feet-short stuff," the bat thought triumphantly; "he was scared!" The bat hung there upside down, trying to work on his new poem. He was happy.

When at last he'd finished the powm--it took him longer than he'd thought--he went looking for the chipmunk. It was a bright afternoon, and the sun blazed in the bat's eyes, so that everything looked blurred and golden. When he met

the chipmunk hurrying down the path that ran past the old stump, he thought: "What a beautiful color he is! Why, the fur back by his tail's rosy, almost. And those lovely black and white stripes on his back!"

"Hello," he said.

"Hello," said the chipmunk. "Is it done yet?"

"All done," said the bat happily. "I'll say it to you. It's named 'The Chipmunk's Day.'"

The chipmunk said in a pleased voice: 'My day." He sat there and listened while the bat said:

In and out the bushes, up the ivy,
Into the hole
By the old oak stump, the chipmunk flashes.
Up the pole.

To the feeder full of seeds he dashes,
Stuffs his cheeks,
The chickadee and titmouse scold him.
Down he streaks.

Red as the leaves the wind blows off the maple,
Red as a fox,
Striped like a skunk, the chipmunk whistles
Past the love seat, past the mailbox,

Down the path,
Home to his warm hole stuffed with sweet
Things to eat.
Neat and slight and shining, his front feet

Curled at his breast, he sits there while the sun
Stripes the red west
With its last light: the chipmunk
Dives to his rest.

When he'd finished the bat asked: "Do you like it?"

For a moment the chipmunk didn't say anything, then he said in a surprised, pleased voice: "Say it again." The bat said it again. When he'd finished, the

chipmunk said: "Oh, it's nice. It all goes in and out, doesn't it?"

The bat was so pleased he didn't know what to say. "Am I really as red as that?" asked the chipmunk.

"Oh yes," the bat said.

"You put in the seeds and the hole and everything," exclaimed the chipmunk. "I didn't think you could. I thought you'd make me more like the owl." Then he said: "Say me the one about the owl."

The bat did. The chipmunk said: "It makes me shiver. Why do I like it if it makes me shiver?"

"I don't know. I see why the owl would like it, but I don't see why we like it."

"Who are you going to do now?" asked the chipmunk.

The bat said: "I don't know. I haven't thought about anybody but you. Maybe I could do a bird."

"Why don't you do the cardinal? He's red and black like me, and he eats seeds at the feeder like me--you'd be in practice."

The bat said doubtfully: "I've watched him, but I don't know him."

"I'll ask him," said the chipmunk. "I'll tell him what it's like, and then he's sure to want to."

"That's awfully nice of you," said the bat. "I'd love to do one about him. I like to watch him feed his babies."

The next day, while the bat was hanging from his rafter fast asleep, the chipmunk ran up the ivy to the porch and called to the bat: "He wants you to." The bat stirred a little and blinked his eyes, and the chipmunk said: "The

cardinal wants you to. I had a hard time telling him what a poem was like, but after I did he wanted you to."

"All right," said the bat sleepily. "I'll start it tonight."

The chipmunk said: "What did you say I was as red as? I don't mean a fox, I remember that."

"As maple leaves. As leaves the wind blows off the maple."

"Oh yes, I remember now," the chipmunk said; he ran off contentedly.

When the bat woke up that night he thought, "Now I'll begin on the cardinal." He thought about how red the cardinal was, and how he sang, and what he ate, and how he fed his big brown babies. But somehow he couldn't get started.

All the next day he watched the cardinal. The bat hung from his rafter, a few feet from the feeder, and whenever the cardinal came to the feeder he'd stare at him and hope he'd get an idea. It was queer the way the cardinal cracked the sunflower seeds; instead of standing on them and hammering them open, like a titmouse, he'd turn them over and over in his beak--it gave him a thoughtful look--and all at once the seed would fall open, split in two. While the cardinal was cracking the seed his two babies stood underneath him on tiptoe, fluttering their wings and quivering all over, their mouths wide open. They were a beautiful soft bright brown--even their beaks were brown--and they were already as big as their father. Really they were old enough to feed themselves, and did whenever he wasn't there; but as long as he was there they begged and begged, till the father would fly down by one and stuff the seed in its mouth, while the other quivered and cheeped as if its heart were breaking. The father was such a beautiful clear bright red, with his tall crest the wind rippled

like fur, that it didn't seem right for him to be so harried and useful and hard-working; it was like seeing a general in a red uniform washing hundreds and hundreds of dishes. The babies followed him everywhere, and kept sticking their open mouths up by his mouth--they shook all over, they begged so hard--and he never got a bite for himself.

But it was no use: no matter how much the bat watched, he never got an idea. Finally he went to the chipmunk and said in a perplexed voice: "I can't make up a poem about the cardinal."

The chipmunk said: "Why, just say what he's like, the way you did with the owl and me."

"I would if I could," the bat said, "but I can't. I don't know why I can't, but I can't. I watch him and he's just beautiful, he'd make a beautiful poem; but I can't think of anything."

"That's queer," the chipmunk said.

The bat said in a discouraged voice: "I guess I can't make portraits of the animals after all."

"What a shame!"

"Oh well," the bat said, "it was just so I'd have somebody to say them to. Now that I've got you I'm all right--when I get a good idea I'll make a poem about it and say it to you."

"I'll tell the cardinal you couldn't," the chipmunk said. "He won't be too disappointed, he never has heard a poem. I tried to tell him what they're like, but I don't think he really understood."

He went off to tell the cardinal, and the bat flew home. He felt relieved; it was wonderful not to have to worry about the cardinal any more.

All morning the mockingbird had been chasing everything out of the yard--he gave you the feeling that having anything else in the world was more than he could bear. Finally he flew up to the porch, sat on the arm of a chair, and began to chirp in a loud, impatient, demanding way, until the lady who lived inside brought him out some raisins. He flew up to a branch, waited impatiently, and as soon as she was gone dived down on the raisins and ate up every one. Then he flew over to the willow and began to sing with all his might.

The bat clung to his rafter, listening drowsily. Sometimes he would open his eyes a little, and the sunlight and the shadows and the red and yellow and orange branches waving in the wind made a kind of blurred pattern, so that he would blink, and let his eyelids steal together, and go contentedly back to sleep. When he woke up it was almost dark; the sunlight was gone, and the red and yellow and orange leaves were all gray, but the mockingbird was still singing.

The porch light was lit, and there were already dozens of insects circling round it. As the bat flew toward them he felt hungry but comfortable.

Just then the mockingbird began to imitate a jay--not the way a jay squawks or scolds but the way he really sings, in a deep soft voice; as he listened the bat remembered how the mockingbird had driven off two jays that morning. He thought: "It;s queer the way he drives everything off and then imitates it. You wouldn't think that--"

And at that instant he had an idea for a poem. The insects were still flying around and around the light, the mockingbird was still imitating the jay, but the bat didn't eat and he didn't listen; he flapped slowly and thoughtfully

back to his rafter and began to work on the poem.

When he finally finished it--he'd worked on it off and on for two nights--he flew off to find the chipmunk. "I've got a new one," he said happily.

"What's it about?"

"The mockingbird."

"The mockingbird!" the chipmunk repeated. "Say it to me." He was sitting up with his paws on his chest, looking intently at the bat--it was the way he always listened.

The bat said:

Look one way and the sun is going down,
Look the other and the moon is rising.
The sparrow's shadow's longer than the lawn.
The bats squeak: "Night is here," the birds cheep:
"Day is gone."
On the willow's highest branch, monopolizing
Day and night, cheeping, squeaking, soaring,
The mockingbird is imitating life.

All day the mockingbird has owned the yard.
As light first woke the world, the sparrows trooped
Onto the seedy lawn: the mockingbird
Chased them off shrieking. Hour by hour, fighting hard
To make the world his own, he swooped
On thrushes, thrashers, jays, and chickadees--
At noon he drove away a big black cat.

Now, in the moonlight, he sits here and sings.
A thrush is singing, then a thrasher, then a jay--
Then, all at once, a cat begins meowing.
A mockingbird can sound like anything.
He imitates the world he drove away.
So well that for a minute, in the moonlight,
Which one's the mockingbird? which one's the world?

When he had finished, the chipmunk didn't say anything; the bat said uneasily, "Did you like it?"

For a minute the chipmunk didn't answer him. Then he said: "It really is

like him. You know, he's chased me. And can he imitate me! You wouldn't think he'd drive you away and imitate you. You wouldn't think he could."

The bat could see that what the chipmunk said meant that he liked the poem, but he couldn't keep from saying: "You do like it?"

The chipmunk said: "Yes, I like it. But he won't like it."

"You liked the one about you," the bat said.

"Yes," the chipmunk answered. "But he won't like the one about him."

The bat said: "But it is like him."

The chipmunk said: "Just like him. Why don't you go say it to him?" I'll go with you."

When they found the mockingbird--it was one of his good days--the bat told him that he had made up a new poem. "Could I say it to you?" he asked. He sounded timid--guilty almost.

"To be sure, to be sure!" answered the mockingbird, and but on his listening expression.

The bat said, "It's a poem about--well, about mockingbirds."

The mockingbird repeated: "About mockingbirds!" His face had changed, so that he had to look listening all over again. Then the bat repeated to the mockingbird his poem about the mockingbird. The mockingbird listened intently, staring at the bat; the chipmunk listened intently, staring at the mockingbird.

When the bat had finished, nobody said anything. Finally the chipmunk said: "Did it take you long to make it up?"

Before the bat could answer, the mockingbird exclaimed angrily: "You sound as if there were something wrong with imitating things!"

"Oh no," the bat said.

"Well then, you sound as if there were something wrong with driving them off. It's my territory, isn't it? If you can't drive things off your own territory what can you do?"

The bat didn't know what to say; after a minute the chipmunk said uneasily, "He just meant it's odd to drive them all off and then imitate them so well too."

"Odd!" cried the mockingbird. "Odd! If I didn't it really would be odd. Did you ever hear of a mockingbird that didn't?"

The bat said politely: "No indeed. No, it's just what mockingbirds do do. That's really why I made up the poem about it--I admire mockingbirds so much, you know."

The chipmunk said: "He talks about them all the time."

"A mockingbird's sensitive," said the mockingbird; when he said sensitive his voice went way up and way back down. "They get on my nerves. You just don't understand how much they get on my nerves. You just don't understand how much they get on my nerves. Sometimes I think if I can't get rid of them I'll go crazy."

"If they didn't get on your nerves so, maybe you wouldn't be able to imitate them so well," the chipmunk said in a helpful, hopeful voice.

"And the way they sing!" cried the mockingbird. "One two three, one two three--the same thing, the same thing, always the same old thing! If only they'd just once sing something different!"

The bat said: "Yes, I can see how hard on you it must be. I meant for the poem to show that, but I'm afraid I must not have done it right."

"You just haven't any idea!" the mockingbird went on, his eyes flashing and

his feathers standing up. "Nobody but a mockingbird has any idea!"

The bat and the chipmunk were looking at the mockingbird with the same impressed, uneasy look From then on they were very careful what they said--mostly they just listened, while the mockingbird told them what it was like to be a mockingbird. Toward the end he seemed considerably calmer and more cheerful, and even told the bat he had enjoyed hearing his poem.

The bat looked pleased, and asked the mockingbird: "Did you like the way I rhymed the first lines of the stanzas and then didn't rhyme the last two?"

The mockingbird said shortly: "I didn't notice"; the chipmunk told the mockingbird how much he always enjoyed hearing the mockingbird sing; and, a little later, the bat the the chipmunk told the mockingbird good-by.

When they had left, the two of them looked at each other and the bat said: "You were right."

"Yes," said the chipmunk. Then he said: "I'm glad I'm not a mockingbird."

"I'd like to be because of the poems," said the bat, "but as long as I'm not, I'm glad I'm not."

"He thinks that he's different from everything else," the chipmunk said, "and he is."

The bat said, just as if he hadn't heard the chipmunk: "I wish I could make up a poem about bats."

The chipmunk asked: "Why don't you?"

"If I had one about bats maybe I could say it to the bats."

"That's right."

For weeks he wished that he had the poem. He would hunt all night, and

catch and eat hundreds and hundreds of gnats and moths and crickets, and all the time he would be thinking: "If only I could make up a poem about bats!" One day he dreamed that it was done and that he was saying it to them, but when he woke up all he could remember was the way it ended:

At sunrise, suddenly, the porch was bats:
A thousand bats were hanging from the rafter.

It had sounded wonderful in his dream, but now it just made him wish that the bats still slept on the porch. He felt cold and lonely. Two squirrels had climbed up in the feeder and were making the same queer noise--a kind of whistling growl--to scare each other away; somewhere on the other side of the house the mockingbird was singing. The bat shut his eyes.

For some reason, he bagan to think of the first things he could remember. Till a bat is two weeks old he's never alone: the little naked thing--he hasn't even any fur--clings to his mother wherever she goes. After that she leaves him at night; he and the other babies hang there sleeping, till at last their mothers come home to them. Sleepily, almost dreaming, the bat began to make up a poem about a mother and her baby.

It was easier than the other poems, somehow; all he had to do was remember what it had been like and every once in a while put in a rhyme. But easy as it was, he kept getting tired and going to sleep, and would forget parts and have to make them over. When at last he finished he went to say it to the chipmunk.

The trees were all bare, and the wind blew the leaves past the chipmunk's hole; it was cold. When the chipmunk stuck his head out it looked fatter than the bat had ever seen it. The chipmunk said in a slow, dazed voice: "It's all full. My hole's all full." Then he exclaimed surprisedly to the bat: "How fat

you are!"

"I?" the bat asked. "I'm fat?" Then he realized it was so; for weeks he had been eating and eating and eating. He said: "I've done my poem about the bats. It's about a mother and her baby."

"Say it to me."

The bat said:

A bat is born
Naked and blind and pale.
His mother makes a pocket of her tail
And catches him. He clings to her long fur
By his thumbs and toes and teeth.
And then the mother dances through the night
Doubling and looping, soaring, somersaulting--
Her baby hangs on underneath.
All night, in happiness, she hunts and flies.
Her high sharp cries
Like shining needlepoints of sound
Go out into the night and, echoing back,
Tell her what they have touched.
She hears how far it is, how big it is,
Which way it's going;
She lives by hearing.
The mother eats the moths and gnats she catches
In full flight; in full flight
The mother drinks the water from the pond
She skims across. Her baby hangs on tight.
Her baby drinks the milk she makes him
In moonlight or starlight, in mid-air.
Their single shadow, printed on the moon
Or fluttering across the stars,
Whirls on all night; at daybreak
The tired mother flaps home to her rafter.
The others all are there.
They hang themselves up by their toes,
They wrap themselves in their brown wings.
Bunched upside down, they sleep in air.
Their sharp ears, their sharp teeth, their
quick sharp faces
Are dull and slow and mild.
All the bright day, as the mother sleeps,
She folds her wings about her sleeping child.

When the bat had finished, the chipmunk said: "It's all really so?"

"Why, of course," the bat said.

"And you do all that too? If you shut your eyes and make a noise you can hear where I am and which way I'm going?"

"Of course."

The chipmunk shook his head and said wonderingly: "You bats sleep all day and fly all night, and see with your ears, and sleep upside down, and eat while you're flying and drink while you're flying, and turn somersaults in mid-air with your baby hanging on, and--and--it's really queer."

The bat said: "Did you like the poem?"

"Oh, of course. Except I forgot it was a poem. I just kept thinking how queer it must be to be a bat."

The bat said: "No, it's not queer. It's wonderful to fly all night. And when you sleep all day with the others it feels wonderful."

The chipmunk yawned. "The end of it made me all sleepy," he said. "But I was already sleepy. I'm sleepy all the time now."

The bat thought, "Why, I am too." He said to the chipmunk: "Yes, it's winter. It's almost winter."

"You ought to say the poem to the other bats," the chipmunk said. "They'll like it just the way I liked the one about me."

"Really?"

"I'm sure of it. When it has all the things you do, you can't help liking it."

"Thank you so much for letting me say it to you," the bat said. "I <u>will</u> say it to them. I'll go say it to them now."

"Good-by," said the chipmunk. "I'll see you soon. Just as soon as I wake up I'll see you."

"Good-by," the bat said.

The chipmunk went back into his hole. It was strange to have him move so heavily, and to see his quick face so slow. The bat flew slowly off to the barn. In the west, over the gray hills, the sun was red: in a little while the bats would wake up and he could say them the poem.

High up under the roof, in the farthest corner of the barn, the bats were hanging upside down, wrapped in their brown wings. Except for one, they were fast asleep. The one the little brown bat lighted by was asleep; when he felt someone light by him he yawned, and screwed his face up, and snuggled closer to the others. "As soon as he wakes up I'll say it to him," the bat thought. "No, I'll wait till they're all awake." On the other side of him was the bat who was awake: that one gave a big yawn, snuggled closer to the others, and went back to sleep.

The bat said to himself sleepily: "I wish I'd said we sleep all winter. That would have been a good thing to have in." He yawned. He thought: "It's almost dark. As soon as it's dark they'll wake up and I'll say them the poem. The chipmunk said they'd love it." He began to say the poem over to himself; he said in a soft contented whisper,

A bat is born
Naked and blind and pale.
His mother makes a pocket of her tail
And catches him. He clings--he clings--

He tried to think of what came next, but he couldn't remember. It was about fur, but he couldn't remember the words that went with it. He went back to the

beginning. He said,

> A bat is born
> Naked and blink--

but before he could get any further, he thought: "I wish I'd said we sleep all winter." His eyes were closed; he yawned, and screwed his face up, and snuggled closer to the others.

STORY NUMBER 1

by

Eugene Ionesco

Josette is thirty-three months old, and she is already a big girl. One morning, just as she does every morning, Josette walks with quick little steps to the door of her parents' bedroom. She tries to open the door, pushing it like a little dog. Then she loses patience and calls out, waking her parents--who pretend not to hear.

On this particular day, papa and mama are tired. Last night they went to the theatre; then, after the theatre, to a restaurant; then, after the restaurant, to a nightclub. And now they feel lazy. And it is not good for parents to feel that way...

The maid loses her patience too. She opens the door of the bedroom and says: "Good morning madame. Good morning sir. Here is your morning newspaper, here are the postcards you have received, here is your coffee with cream and sugar, here is your fruit juice, here are your rolls, here is your toast, here is your butter, here is your orange marmalade, here is your strawberry jam, here are your fried eggs, here is your ham, and here is your little girl."

The parents feel sick, because (to tell the truth) after the nightclub they went to another restaurant. They don't want to drink their coffee, they don't want the toast, they don't want the rolls, they don't want the ham, they don't want the eggs, they don't want the orange marmalade, they don't want their fruit juice, they don't want the strawberry jam (which isn't strawberry anyway, but more orange).

"Give all that to Josette," says papa to the maid, "and bring her back to

us after she had eaten."

The maid takes the little girl in her arms. Josette howls. But because she is greedy, she consoles herself in the kitchen by eating mama's marmalade, papa's jam, and both her parents' rolls. Then she drinks the fruit juice.

"Oh, what a little monster!" said the maid. "You have a belly as big as your eyes."

To help the little girl (so that she will not be sick) the maid drinks the coffee and eats the eggs and the ham--and also some rice with milk which had been left from the night before.

During this time, papa and mama fall back to sleep and begin to snore. But not for long. The maid brings Josette back to the bedroom.

"Papa, Jacqueline--" says Josette, "Jacqueline ate your ham."

"That's all right," says papa.

"Papa," says Josette, "tell me a story."

And while mama sleeps (because she is exhausted from having celebrated too much), papa tells Josette a story.

"Once there was a little girl named Jacqueline."

"Like Jacqueline?" asks Josette.

"Yes," says papa, "but this wasn't Jacqueline. Jacqueline was a little girl. She had a mama who was named Mrs. Jacqueline. Her papa was named Mr. Jacqueline. The little Jacqueline had two sisters who were both names Jacqueline, and two boy cousins who were named Jacqueline, and two girl cousins who were named Jacqueline, and an aunt and an uncle who were named Jacqueline. The uncle and the aunt named Jacqueline had some friends named Mr. and Mrs. Jacqueline

who had a little girl named Jacqueline and a little boy named Jacqueline. The little girl had three dolls named Jacqueline, Jacqueline, and Jacqueline, and Jacqueline. The little boy had a friend named Jacqueline, and some wooden horses named Jacqueline, and some toy soldiers named Jacqueline.

"One day little Jacqueline, with her papa Jacqueline and her little brother Jacqueline, and her mama Jacqueline, went to the park. There they met their freinds the Jacquelines, with their little girl Jacqueline, their little boy Jacqueline, with the toy soldiers named Jacqueline, with the dols Jacqueline, Jacqueline and Jacqueline."

As papa is telling the story to Josette, the maid comes in. "You are going to drive the child crazy, sir," she says.

"Jacqueline, are you going shopping?" says Josette to the maid. (Remember, the maid is also named Jacqueline.)

Josette goes off to run some errands with the maid.

Papa and mama fall asleep again because they are very tired. The night before, they went to a restaurant, to the theatre, again to a restaurant, to a nightclub, then again to a restaurant.

Josette goes into a shop with the maid, where she meets a little girl who is with her parents. Josette says, "Want to play with me? What's your name?"

The little girl says: "My name is Jacqueline."

"I know," says Josette. "Your papa is named Jacqueline, your mama is named Jacqueline, your little brother is named Jacqueline, your doll is named Jacqueline, your grandpapa is named Jacqueline, your wooden horse is named Jacqueline, your house is named Jacqueline, your little chamber pot is named Jacqueline..."

Then the grocer, the grocer's wife, the little girl's mother, and all the customers in the store turn toward Josette and look at her with big, frightened eyes.

"It's nothing," the maid said calmly. "Don't be upset. These are just the silly stories her papa tells her."